

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

**HAROLD
ANSON**

Class

230.03 S

Book

An 82

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

**AUTHORITY
IN RELIGION**



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

The Practical Christianity Series

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

BY

HAROLD ANSON

AUTHOR OF "A PRACTICAL FAITH,"

"SPIRITUAL HEALING," ETC.



THE CENTURY CO.

New York

London

THE CENTURY COMPANY

NEW YORK

1907

230.03 S

An 82

86236

Copyright, 1929, by
THE CENTURY Co.

First printing

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

AMERICAN BOOK CO.
NEW YORK
1929

INTRODUCTION

THIS book contains addresses given to a general audience at the University of Leeds, at the request of the Vice-Chancellor, and has been published to meet the desire of some of those who heard them, in the hope that they may be of use to others also. They have been repeated again at Birmingham, on the invitation of the Vicar of the Parish Church of that city.

My hope is that they may help some who are, amid many difficulties, finding their way to an assured and steady faith in the good purpose of God for the life of man.

There are many, I know, who have so strong a craving for a religion founded upon a definite external authority that they cannot endure the uncertainties involved in the effort to reach a knowledge of the truth. People of this type are finding their way very rapidly into the Roman Catholic Church, which receives into its fold some twelve thousand people in Great Britain every year, mainly drawn from other Churches.

Introduction

But there are many others who could not accept the conclusions to which that Church is committed without a disloyalty to their conscience, which would make any kind of religion impossible.

Those of us who feel this believe also that God wills us to find our way to Him, not without pain and difficulty, through being constantly true to the experience of our own conscience.

Many Christian leaders to-day believe that a unity of Christians can be brought about, if only the present members of the Churches can find some terms of agreement in regard to the ancient creeds and the traditional ministries. They think that people who are in earnest about religion are mainly concerned with these questions, and that it is disagreement on these and such-like questions which keeps Christians apart. That is not my own experience. I do not find that the most thoughtful people are very much interested in the ancient creeds or in the forms of Church government. It might be quite possible to unite all the present members of Churches under one government, and leave outside most of the people who are deeply concerned about religion.

One belief seems to unite most of the leaders
[vi]

Introduction

of Christian Churches. It is that new wine can be put into old bottles—that new truths can be expressed in old formularies and in traditional societies. They may prove to be right. It may be that the present Churches will so far restate their old formularies that they may express, with such precision as is possible in regard to such transcendent mysteries, the truths which are dawning upon our new age. If that should be so, it would seem to be a great gain. But I believe that no good will come by minimizing the changes which have come about in our thought, or slurring over the conclusions at which we are arriving, and we have high authority for being more concerned for the fate of the new wine than for that of the old bottles.

It is taken for granted that a man who believes on insufficient evidence the whole creed of Tennessee, is quite a good candidate for the ministry, whereas a man who anxiously tries to arrive at the real evidence for statements of fact *may* be, with some hesitation, allowed to pass in. It is here that the spirit of traditional religion differs from that of science. Science values a man because he shows a scrupulously pure love of truth; it is that, and not the actual conclusions at which he arrives, which constitutes his worth. Traditional religion still is apt

Introduction

to value a man because he shows the skill of a barrister in presenting a case to which he is already committed, and is also skilful in not even allowing himself subconsciously to see the case against it. It would still, in most Churches, disqualify a man from high office to refuse publicly to affirm his belief in the Virgin Birth or the physical resurrection of Christ's body; it would be no disqualification at all, but rather a recommendation, if he had never doubted these things, though most unprejudiced historians would assert that the evidence for either was, at least, conflicting and somewhat lacking in cogency. It would be a barrier to high office to deny these statements; it does not appear always that it is a barrier to be conspicuously lacking in gentleness and love, or in a critical desire to know and preach the truth.

The Church of the future will not, I believe, be founded upon a common agreement as to the historical value of facts which have a doubtful historical value, but upon a common possession of gentleness and courage and wisdom, and a practical application of these Christ-like virtues to the obstinate situations of practical life, with the Spirit of Jesus as our Master and Guide.

I do not want to contend that theology is

Introduction

valueless. I feel very deeply that men who have an intellect given them by God must endeavor to formulate their beliefs intellectually; if they do not, religion is all too apt to degenerate into sentimentality; but our theology must be built up anew upon our practical knowledge of life, and our new knowledge of what constitutes valid historical evidence. Some of my most intimate friends have a great distrust of theology—they regard it as the enemy of vital religion. I believe that is because our present systems and formularies lay such stress upon things which we have come to regard as either doubtful or unimportant, and so little on things which to us are of cardinal worth. But this means not that we should scrap theology, but that we should build up theology again on the basis of our practical experience of the actual working of God in our own lives. We are probably not yet ready to attempt this. Our experiences of God's working are still unformulated. We feel sure that God does not very much care what we believe about the birth of Jesus, or the consecration of bishops, or the forms of celebrating the Sacraments. We feel sure that He certainly cares a very great deal about our love for one another expressed in our social institutions and in our habitual treatment of one

Introduction

another; we are sure that He cares more that we should be sincere in our thinking than that we should agree with the traditions of the elders; we are sure that He cares more for mercy than for services. But we are probably not yet ready to express in any formula just what constitutes the creed of a Christian. When we are able to do this, I believe that many of the present disputes of theologians will seem quite inconceivably archaic.

An ideal of practical religion is gradually appearing on the surface of our life to-day, partly within, largely outside, the organized Churches. We are beginning to come to some conclusions as to the way God does actually love, and does educate, human beings, how He does actually incarnate Himself in this world of space and time, what kind of values He cares for, and what He ignores. When we see all this more clearly than we now do, then, I believe, and not till then, we shall be ready to say what our Creed should be, and what the Articles of our Faith. They will be different in tone from our present formularies, I feel sure; the stress will not be laid on the same matters of belief; but I have no fear at all that they will express less clearly the mind of Christ.

Meanwhile, we must "tarry in Jerusalem until

[x]

Introduction

we are endued with power from on high," that is, we must do our best to live the life of faith within the formularies and ministries in which we have been brought up, and to which some of us, at least (in which number I include myself), owe so deep a debt of gratitude for such knowledge of God's ways as we have. We have need of much patience and much forbearance with one another, and great humility as to our own capacity to understand the strange ways in which God is leading us. With such equipment we need have no fears; and we may be deeply thankful that it is in this age of unrest, and in no other, that we have been set to learn our lessons and serve the mysterious purposes of God.

I find that many of the thoughts which I have tried to express here are almost identical, even in wording, with statements in Canon Streeter's "Reality" and Mr. Sheppard's "The Impatience of a Parson." I had not read either of these books when I wrote these addresses, but the reading of them reminds me afresh how much I owe to these writers, as well as to the late Mr. A. Clutton-Brock, whose sayings and writings are always fresh and living in my remembrance.

HAROLD ANSON

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	V

CHAPTER I

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION	3
---------------------------------	---

On what grounds do we believe in religion?—The changed emphasis in regard to authority in modern times—Reluctance to admit external authority—Why did Jesus believe in God?—On what ground did He base the validity of His own message?—Is the modern view productive of scepticism and sectarianism, or does it lead to increasing assurance and unity?

CHAPTER II

THE IDEA OF THE INFINITE	32
------------------------------------	----

What do we mean by God? Is it the apotheosis of the *status quo*?—The significance of the feeling of imperfection—Is our sense of the importance of values destined to frustration?—Is God best described as Personality or Principle?—The idea of Jesus concerning God—The "Christian Science" idea of God's nescience of evil—God as "becoming" as well as eternal.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF MAN	54
-----------------------------	----

The evolution of man not a fortuitous process—The distinction between man as spirit and his bodily instrument of manifestation—Smuts on "Holism"—Evolution of mankind to-day proceeding by purposeful *interference* with the processes of nature: elimination and sublimation—Christianity offers us the life of Jesus as a symbol of the evolution of man through temptation and suffering—The Cross is a symbol of man's upward path toward development through the mastering of hostile environment—Man's salvation is first bodily, then mental, finally spiritual—These three departments of growth, once treated as a single process, are now split into departments, but are destined to be in ever closer alliance—God does not exempt the good from the common hard lot of mankind.

CHAPTER IV

PRAYER, MAGIC AND SCIENCE	76
-------------------------------------	----

Creation as a continuous activity still in process, carried out through man's coöperation—Prayer is man's effort to explore, and co-operate with, this process of the creation of new values—Prayer distinguished from Magic, which is the attempt to utilize God for our own ends—The value of Magic in the history of man—Primitive ideas of prayer contain ele-

Contents

ments of Magic, but are not lightly on that account to be despised—Magic distinguishable from Sacramentalism—The analogy between the spirit of the Scientist and Prayer—"Saying prayers"—Miraculous answers.

PAGE

CHAPTER V

RELIGION AND SECULAR LIFE 98

"The things of Cæsar and the things of God"
—We cannot escape from life in a community
—Christianity arose in a State where religious and secular life had been abnormally disrupted—The ideal of the free Church in the free State, with complete differentiation of function: the medieval idea of Pope and Emperor—The Anglican idea of the Sovereign as God's vice-regent—The weakness of this typically English solution—The marriage of Church and State.

CHAPTER VI

IMMORTALITY AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH . 122

The desire for survival—Grounds for belief in individual survival—The meaning of *resurrectio carnis*: conditional immortality—The testimony of psychical research to survival—Necessity to discount much of the evidence—Henry James's testimony—The revelations of St. Mechtilde and St. Gertrude—The limitations of psychical research as proof of Immortality.

Contents

PAGE

CHAPTER VII

CHURCH AND STATE 159

The modern divorce between religion and business—Distinction between the technique of business and its objectives—The history of the Church's interference in matters of contract—Marriage as a contract in which the Church claims to interfere—Slavery and forced labor—Pure individualism anti-Christian.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN 180

The conflict between our craving for the ideal and our desire to face actual fact—The present age desires, in the interest of truth, to emphasize the ugly facts of life—Jesus believed in the world of ideals, and faced the ugliness of reality—Religion must incarnate itself in this actual world—Wordsworth the type of the true sacramentalist—Religion must face the problem of the institutionalizing of the eternal facts, and the continuous spiritualizing of the institutions which owe their origin to the Spirit.

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

I

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

THE question which I wish to put and, I hope, in some small measure to answer, in this book is this: "Why should a man in these modern days of ours believe in the religion of Christ?"

And before we begin to ask ourselves what that religion is, it may be well that I should begin by putting the question as to the basis upon which authority in religion rests. On what grounds do we believe any religion, or hold any serious views about life and the world, at all?

Now, I think, if we examine our personal experience and that of the men and women whom we intimately know, we shall find that we all get our religious beliefs in the first place from personal external authority, either from

Authority in Religion

our parents or our teachers, or some friend in whom we have confidence. We believe that certain doctrines about life are true, because we have confidence in our intimate friends, and we accept their views of life entirely upon their authority, because we trust them.

This method of approach to religious truth, which is often called "blind belief," is not altogether blind or irrational. We have some real ground for trusting our parents' infallibility. They have told us what foods were wholesome and what poisonous; what courses of action, such as playing with fire, or loitering in a crowded street, brought danger and pain; and we have proved by our own experience that they were generally right. We also discovered that their views were shared, on these subjects, by most of the people whom we came across. Even on subjects in which we felt sure they were wrong, such as the necessity for going to school, or getting up early on cold dark mornings, we found afterward that there was more sound basis for these uncomfortable beliefs than we should have suspected, and our belief in their general infallibility was thus confirmed.

This view of authority was, then, neither blind nor irrational. It rested upon much the same basis as the reasoning which made Dr.

Authority in Religion

Newman become a Roman Catholic, and Newman was not an irrational person. The saying of St. Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum"—"The universal belief of the whole world affords us a sure basis of judgment"—which saying turned Newman to consider the claims of the Roman Catholic Church, is very much the same reasoning as that which we used when we were children—and this belief saves us, in fact, from many troubles, and prevents our wasting our time and endangering our lives by walking down many blind and dangerous by-paths. If we insisted upon testing for ourselves our parents' or teachers' opinions as to the edibility of fruits and plants, or the risks of walking upon the roof of the house, our chances of coming to any opinions about anything at all would be brief and precarious. Premature death would preclude any further speculations about life at all.

It is, then, a very sound course of reasoning which dictates to us the belief that we are wise to begin by accepting the beliefs of the whole group to which we belong about the truths of life.

But if we are people who think at all, we have not advanced very far in life before we discover that our infallible guides do not all agree with

Authority in Religion

one another. Perhaps we find that our father and mother disagree as to the value of alcohol as a beverage, or as to the value of church-going as a means of averting disasters from the home, or as to the risk of eternal damnation in the use of strong language. Even about quite small things we discover that the parents of our friends do not agree with ours—as, for instance, the necessity of wearing great-coats, or the propriety of going frequently to the cinema, or going to bed late. We discover that equally good people hold diverse opinions, and also that, in regard to questions of religion, politics and ethics, the divergence of opinion is far greater than on questions of eating and drinking and the ordinary, obvious daily needs of mankind.

Thus we are suddenly, or sometimes by degrees, thrown back into a general skepticism about life. We begin to ask questions with a view of discovering the basis upon which our parents' opinions rest. Sometimes we find that this basis is incredibly precarious. "Why mayn't I do this?" we ask. "Because you mustn't," "Because I tell you, and if you ask again you'll have a good smacking." An intelligent boy or girl soon begins to suspect such reasoning, though it is, after all, the identical

Authority in Religion

reasoning offered to grown-up men and women by many religious teachers or organizations to-day.

From the moment of asking these questions and receiving these irrational answers, or no answers at all, a great crisis arises in the intellectual life of the individual. He may acquiesce in this solution, that he must not ask questions about life, but accept the verdict of the group to which he belongs. Then his mind closes up, and he never thinks again. He may be quite a decent member of society, a good laborer, or parent, or politician, or priest, but he will never help in making the thought of the world progress.

There is an immense difference in people in regard to the age at which their minds become closed. Some people's minds close at about the age of fourteen. They never afterward think again. This is, I am afraid, true of a very large percentage of the boys and girls of our elementary schools. Others keep an open mind, and still ask some questions, until they are about twenty-one; others until they are forty or fifty, and then they spend the rest of their lives in lamenting the terrible laxity of the views of the rising generation. Only a very few keep their minds open all their lives, being always

ready for new truths and new habits of living.

It is at the adolescent stage of life that it becomes so important for the individual to release himself from that enslavement and total dependence upon the life of the group which, in the earlier stages of life, has been so extremely valuable.

If the group (the home, the school, the Church) is too powerful, the young person may never effect his liberation, and a deep repression may work havoc in his life, by making him cruel to others by way of compensation for his own enslavement: or he may work his freedom with such violence, and at so great a cost to his own peace, that he may become fanatically distrustful of all expert authority, and become a violent rebel against Church and State. The present condition of Russia, where the whole nation has escaped by violence from an unspeakably cruel tyranny in Church and State, is an instance of this. Such people are very apt, in throwing off one despotic authority, to fall into the hands of another, and perhaps a worse one, and their last state may be worse than the first. They go through life flitting from the tyranny of one dictatorship, only to fall into the hands of another, like the people of Italy, who, in escaping from slavery

Authority in Religion

to the Church, become violent and aggressive atheists.

I would ask you now to consider the teaching and example of Jesus Christ in regard to this problem of authority.

We find Jesus at first winning to Himself a small group of men and women who were attracted to Him by the singular charm of His personality, and also by the compelling nature of His teaching upon the conscience of those who heard it. They were won at first by His personal attractiveness. We can all understand this. There are certain people whom we long to be able to agree with as soon as we see them. We hope we shall find ourselves on their side in politics or in religion. We start with a prejudice in their favor. And other great men there are whom one can only believe in if one never sees them. If one meets them it is almost incredible to us to suppose that what they teach is true. Now Jesus won disciples at first by His personal charm, as the Pharisees probably lost them by their personal offensiveness. This personal attractiveness is, no doubt, a precarious basis upon which to accept the teachings of a prophet, but it is undoubtedly a powerful and legitimate force in political and religious life. But about Jesus there was evi-

Authority in Religion

dently something beyond personal charm. "He spake with authority, and not like the scribes." His sayings came home to the conscience: they won the conscience as His person had won the heart: they struck the hearers with a note of supreme reality. This experience also we know well. Occasionally in some essay, or article, or sermon, one hears one sentence which smites upon one, and we say, "That is *so* true! That is what I have always been wanting to hear." We have, as a matter of fact, never heard it said before, but directly we hear it we feel we have always known it, and known it is the very truth. The experience is like being reminded of something we had once known and then forgotten. It at once, with a sort of magisterial authority, assures us of its truth. The experience is like the glorious revelation of a mountain view when the clouds suddenly disperse. We see at once what we knew always must be there, and henceforward we can never doubt the truth of the vision we have seen.

So it must have been with the great sayings of Jesus, now so familiar to us that we find it difficult to recapture their significance and their compulsive charm. So different they were from the dry, conventional rationalizations of the worthy scribes, who repeated as they had

Authority in Religion

learnt them the truths which, having never moved their own hearts, would never grip the hearts of those to whom they were so wearisomely retailed.

So the disciples substituted one external authority for another. They believed a new set of truths, and discarded others in which they had believed; but still they were accepting this new way of life, chiefly because they loved and trusted the teacher, and only partly because they saw that the teaching itself was true. Thus the basis of their belief was still precarious, because the teacher might disappear, and, as we know so well in our own experience, with the disappearance of the teacher, the feeling of the truth of the experience is apt to vanish at the same time. But I think it is abundantly clear that Jesus sought to shift the emphasis of the disciples' faith from belief in His teaching, because *He* guaranteed their truth, *to* a belief in them because of the witness in the hearts and minds of the hearers that the teachings in themselves were intrinsically true. He welcomed the power of the disciples to form judgments of their own, to act upon their own initiative, even though many of these attempts were sorry enough. Jesus seems also, if we accept the discourses of the Fourth Gospel as a genuine com-

Authority in Religion

mentary upon His teaching, to have taught that there is in man a spirit, a criterion of judgment, which is in itself trustworthy and is in fact the voice of God. This spirit can be hindered by disloyalty to truth, and fostered by loyalty and a sincere desire to know what is true. This spirit, as it is increasingly nourished and trusted, will cause us not any longer to base our beliefs on the mere *ipse dixit* of any great teacher or external organization, but to know by an inward sense of certainty what is true or false; and to accept teaching which comes to us from great men, not because the teaching is guaranteed by the teacher, but because it is guaranteed to us by the voice of the spirit within us.

It is important, I think, to note that this voice of the Spirit, which assures us of truth, is not only the voice of an inward emotion, but must be as well the verdict of the intellect. "All great ideas," it has been well said, "come from the heart, but they must go round by the head." How true this is! The great truths of life come to us generally in the first place as an emotional experience. They are received by the heart before the intellect can confirm them. But so long as they remain uncriticized by the intellect, their claim to acceptance is precarious. Religion has

Authority in Religion

suffered much by the dominance of beliefs which are accepted because they are romantically beautiful; legends which appeal powerfully to the sentiments, which even stir people to good deeds, but which rest on no foundation of fact, and thus those who care for the music of life are separated from those who care for truth in life, to the great loss of both classes of the community.

So Jesus urged upon those who heard Him not to accept Him because of His own witness to the truth of what He said, but because of the witness of the spirit in man to the truth of what He taught.

It is greatly to be regretted that the Churches which based their existence upon the teaching of Christ have so largely departed from His teaching in this respect.

So often Churches have said, "You must believe this because the Bible says it is true," or "because the Church says it is true," instead of saying, "This we believe to be true, and the spirit will convince *you* of the truth of it, if you are giving yourself up to the spirit of truth, if you are in your daily actions sincere and truth-loving."

No doubt Churches have been so convinced of the truth of their dogma that they felt that

to deny it, or to doubt it, was a sure indication that the individual was *not* being loyal to the spirit of truth; but the Churches have so often been proved wrong in the deductions which, from time to time, they have asserted to follow infallibly from belief in Christ's teaching, that they ought by now to be ready to believe that all Churches are alike liable to error, and to be ready to grant that, where individuals doubt or discard certain beliefs of the Bible or the Church, it is not necessarily because they are leading bad lives, or are careless, or foolish, but possibly because God is leading a new generation into the understanding of some truth which has been hitherto hidden from the Church itself.

Christ Himself pointed out how often the dictates of the individual heart are more sound than the tradition of the elders. The man who pulled out a beast from the ditch, or brought a sick man to be healed, on the Sabbath, ran counter to all the tradition of the elders. The priest who gave the holy bread to the exhausted warriors of David, the bread which only the priest might eat, was, he said, more nearly following the true tradition of the Spirit than if he had, according to the letter of the law, denied it to them. All experienced religious teachers

Authority in Religion

of His day declared that it was unlawful to eat without previous washing of the hands. Christ declared that the simple men, who made light of the rule, were nearer to God than those who kept it.

St. Paul, who is so often accused of having obscured the teaching of Christ, when he is consulted as to whether one day ought to be regarded as holier than another, and whether one kind of diet is more religious than another, does not cut short the discussion by affirming the authority of the Church (as would assuredly have been done at a later date), but he says quite clearly that such matters rested with the conscience of the individual. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but goodness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." St. Paul takes immense trouble to commend himself and his teaching to every man's conscience in the sight of God. He does not, except in certain disciplinary cases, in the handling of which he does not appear to us to reach his best level, speak as an autocrat, but as an expert, appealing to reasonable people whom he would convince by the cogency of his argument rather than compel by the weight of his reputation.

Authority in Religion

It has been the habit of religious leaders in times past to ground their appeal upon the validity of certain texts, or the infallibility of an institution. Even in the case of so profound a teacher as St. Thomas Aquinas we see the struggle between the desire to convince by argument and the tyranny of textual authority. Some proposition is put forward; a text—divorced as often as not from its context—is adduced in favor of the proposition. Another text perhaps is brought forward in opposition, and a final conclusion is arrived at, but all through we feel that the tyrannous authority of the text interferes with the cogency of the reasoning. And how often we feel this to be true in modern polemical books. We see a certain parade of reasoning, showing us why such and such a conclusion should be accounted true, but we are always quite sure that we shall be led in the long run to the conclusion that all the traditions of the elders are to be held sacred. The reasoning is a camouflage for the pre-arranged conclusion which has to be accepted on quite other grounds, viz., the tradition of the Church or the letter of the Scriptures.

It has been said by a modern teacher of philosophy that there are two classes of believers in Christianity: those who believe that

Authority in Religion

Christian teaching is true because Christ tells them it is so, and those who believe in Christ because they believe His teachings on other grounds to be true. The typical believer of the traditionalist kind believes in Christ because he believes Him to have been wonderfully born, foretold by prophecy, a worker of miracles, and to have been raised from the dead. On these grounds he believes Christ's teachings to be true. The typical modern believer does not take any of these miraculous events for granted, and, if he accepts them as historical, does not believe that such events are any guarantee of the truth of the teaching given. He examines the teaching in the light of all that he knows of what we call the three great ultimate values—goodness, truth and beauty, and he accepts the teacher as a prophet because he sees the teaching to be true and beautiful and good. "By their fruits," Christ said (not by their claims, nor by their miracles), "ye shall know them"—and as to the goodness of the fruit, we are held capable of discrimination. We feel this to be a wise criterion of belief.

If we are to judge of a tree by its fruits, then we are not irreverent or unwise in applying this test to Christ Himself, and testing Him by the fruits of His life and teaching, and this

must mean by *our judgment* upon the fruits of His teaching. Christ does, in fact, submit His claims to the judgment of men. If we love the light we shall accept them, because they are of the light.

It may seem to many people that thus to set up our own judgment as a basis of authority is not only immodest, but also that it must necessarily lead to endless disagreement and confusion. "Who am I that I should set up my own judgment against the tradition of the elders, or the august *magisterium* of the Scriptures? How likely that such generations of good men should be right: how likely that I should be wrong!" How wise that saying which so haunted Newman sounds: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*"! How foolish to dispute the universal consensus of mankind! When Athanasius finds himself alone *contra mundum*, how immodest it sounds for Athanasius to believe himself to be in the right! And, we must admit, how often, in practice, the individual *is* in the wrong! How often the tradition of the elders *is* in fact right! Is it not then the path of safety to assume that it is always right? *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—that which has been "always, everywhere, and by all men" believed—is not that a good and safe rule for the

Authority in Religion

poor, wayward, ignorant individual to adopt?

Now let us note some considerations which may lead us to hesitate before agreeing to such a conclusion.

(1) It is easy to achieve unanimity by suppressing the opposition. Mussolini can boast that there is now no single newspaper in Italy which does not support his policy. The Pope can boast that there is no single Catholic bishop or priest, in any country of the world, who does not believe in the infallibility of his teaching. But what does this amount to? It means simply, in either case, that anyone who *did* disagree would be promptly suppressed. By such methods unanimity is as easily achieved as it is morally worthless. And the same is true in every Church where the teachers are compelled to forego open discussion of the grounds of religion. The impressive show of unanimity is wholly fictitious. Those Jews who were inclined to confess Christ were, on one occasion, we are told, afraid to do so because, if they did so, they would be put out of the synagogue. Their consequent testimony against Him, though practically unanimous, was therefore valueless.

(2) Let us remember also that almost every exploded superstition has been held, up to the

Authority in Religion

moment of its first being challenged, *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*; it has been believed “always, everywhere, and by all.”

This would have been true of the propositions that men could not fly, or that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, up to the time when one man challenged and overthrew them. Every great truth which has been won for mankind has been first asserted by some one person who pitted his authority against the world. “Criticize thy father and thy mother”—it has been said—“is the first commandment with promise.” Only when each generation works over again the arguments which have been urged, and the conclusions arrived at, by the last, is there any hope of general advancement. This does not mean, I repeat again, that we shall necessarily find that the arguments or conclusions of previous generations are wrong; I believe that, generally speaking, we shall find that their arguments were wrong, and their conclusions, in the main, right; for men are more often right in their conclusions than in the reasonings by which they support them: but we shall gain a new certainty by reëxamination of the argument, and in some cases we shall advance by denying the conclusions at which past generations have arrived.

(3) We must remember that experts are by no means always safe guides. "The worst of great thinkers," said John Bright, "is that they usually think wrong." This would indeed be a melancholy conclusion to arrive at if it were generally true; but of course it is a saying which we need not too seriously accept. We doubtless are right in treating the opinion of experts with respect: but we have to remember that the expert is seldom an expert outside his own limited sphere. The "experienced person" is often a person who knows admirably how to adjust himself to a particular set of facts with which he has gained by familiarity an intimate knowledge. Each generation as it grows old appeals to the young to respect its experience. But the young often rightly feel that the facts which they have to face are new, and that the "experienced person" is sometimes positively disqualified from facing the new facts by reason of his experience of conditions which no longer exist.

The man who had traveled every day for seventy years in a stage-coach was doubtless a great expert in the art of traveling, but this very experience might have, and probably would have, the result of making him unwilling to face the problems of traveling by rail. A fine old

admiral who has served a lifetime with the utmost distinction in wooden sailing-ships may be a peculiarly bad judge as to the necessity for the use of iron-clad battleships; and the cavalry general may be the last person to see the value of tanks or armored cars. So the man who has spent a lifetime in "proving religion" from Biblical texts is doubtless an expert in that thankless and somewhat discredited occupation, but it may very likely disqualify him from envisaging a totally new set of arguments which, being unfamiliar, are probably disastrous to him.

"We need," said Mr. Clutton-Brock, "not [a world of *experienced* people, but a world of *experiencing* people"; not of people who, by reason of being experienced, have now left off experiencing, but of people who are continually experiencing anew. So often we feel about Churches and political parties that while they are very experienced, they have long ago left off experiencing, and therefore their immense experience of a condition of things now past, or passing away, is no longer of value, and is often even a positive disqualification for guiding us in new circumstances of life.

These considerations will, perhaps, make us understand why Christ appealed to simple

Authority in Religion

people to judge between Him and all the tradition of their religious past, and why He said that God often hid things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to babes; the young and unsophisticated can sometimes approach a problem without the prepossessions which obsess the wise and prudent.

I would ask you to realize that, in thus urging that we should not be too much overawed by the prestige of great religious organizations or traditions, the alternative is not that every one should follow his own individual conscience, unaided by the facts of experience. No one, in fact, does this. In all walks of life we defer to authorities, judging them not by their university distinctions or their military decorations, but by the actual fruit of their conclusions. No sane person would suggest that the individual should not make use of the labors and experience of learned men. Truth comes to men through the inspiration of prophets, poets, artists and men of heroic action. We see through their eyes and by means of their insight: we see things which, without them, would have been always hidden. "The Holy Ghost speaks by the prophets"; not, be it observed, by the councils, or the Popes, or the bishops. Men of inspiration speak; and those who are

spiritually attuned hear their voice. "My sheep hear My voice and follow Me." The right of private judgment does not mean the duty of acting by an *unenlightened* judgment; it means the right and duty of judging the expert by his fruits, and of enlightening our judgment by taking all the means which are at our disposal to gain more light.

It does, however, mean that we do seriously believe that there is for every individual (however simple he may be) a Divine voice, which speaks to all who with care and perseverance attune their ears to hear it, and which gives to all men sufficient enlightenment to meet the needs of their own particular life.

This is the meaning of believing in the Holy Spirit. We believe that the Divine voice does not stop short in giving us only such a measure of enlightenment as is needed to hand over our lives and our thinking to some external authority: we believe that "we have an unction from the Holy One." We believe that it is the will of God to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, so that our sons and our daughters shall prophesy, our young men shall see visions, and our old men dream dreams; and that upon our very servants and handmaidens He will pour forth His Spirit. We believe that God will no more

Authority in Religion

write His commandments upon tables of stone, but upon the fleshy tables of the heart.

If we believe this, we shall believe that religion is not mere imitation of any teacher, however enlightened, or passive submission to a Church, however ancient, but is the cultivation of a direct relationship with the voice of God within us, who will reveal to us the eternal truths of life, and make them available for our needs.

This authoritative voice within will not give us access to *all* truth, but to just so much of truth as is necessary for the particular work which each of us has to do in life. It will become clearer to us as we listen to it more and more sincerely: and it will very often confirm and deepen our appreciation and reverence of that body of truth which we first received from external authority, while in other directions it may lead us to modify or reject what we have by external authority been taught.

Let us consider now one practical objection which is constantly brought against this view of religious authority. It is urged that this belief in private judgment will lead to endless diversity of belief, and will in practice deprive the simple folk of any sure guide in life.

Now if we really believe in the Holy Spirit,

Authority in Religion

we shall believe that this will not be the case: because, if we are all seeking honestly for the Truth, we shall not, if there is One Spirit of God, be led to endless diversity, but to an increasing measure of unity. Nor do we find that this in actual practice is the case. We find a wonderful unity in practice in regard to the really important decisions of life among those who are alike sincerely striving after Truth, even though they do not submit their consciences blindly to any external guide. No circumstance, I feel, does more to confirm our belief in the reality of the Divine guidance of individuals than the view of this substantial harmony about matters of real importance which comes from acting on this belief. It is true that about matters of lesser importance there is an equally impressive divergence, but perhaps it is true, as St. Paul observes in regard to meats and drinks and holy days, that he that regardeth a day, unto the Lord he regardeth it, and he that regardeth not a day, unto the Lord he doth not regard it. These things are indifferent, and we may well differ about them, even widely and openly, without anxiety or reproach. The mind that is seriously upset because his brother fasts, or does not fast, on some particular day, or because his minister wears a white

Authority in Religion

gown or a black gown, probably needs to learn that such things are indifferent in the sight of God, and that it is a useful moral discipline for us to tolerate such differences among ourselves.

We have all heard the old story of the undergraduate who thought his private coach so much wiser than the university professors, because, said he, "the professors tell me that there are different views about some subject, and we cannot be certain which is the true view; but my coach tells me which view *is* true, and he is in no doubt at all about it. He therefore must be the really wise man."

There are many people who feel in the same sort of way about religious teachings. They want religious certainty above all things. They crave for certainty more than for truth. They cannot tolerate hesitation or doubt. They cannot have too much certainty. Like Dr. Ward, the celebrated Tractarian, they would like a new definition of doctrine, hot from Rome, every day with their breakfast. We find such people in all denominations. But this craving for certainty is often the enemy of truth. For the pursuit of truth must involve patience and sacrifice. It is like the pearl of great price, for which we must sell all that we have if we would buy it, and if we really care for truth we must

Authority in Religion

often be content to have no other answer to deep questions but "I do not know."

It is often assumed that if God wishes us to know religious truth, He will provide some vehicle by which it shall be infallibly conveyed to us. But this is not so in any other department of life. There exists no book, or body of persons, which can tell us what is beautiful in music or in poetry or in painting; there is no divinely appointed oracle to tell us what is true in medical science, or indeed in any other science; yet how much misery would not mankind have been saved if such an authority had existed?

It is not then very likely that God has appointed any book, or any body or persons, who have a claim to be accepted as an infallible guide in matters of religious truth. Judging by our experience of other sciences, we should not expect to find such an infallible authority.

I wish now to try to meet an objection often raised against the sketch of the theory of religious authority which I have tried to outline.

"Is it not a fact," I may be asked, "that those who accept the authority of experts simply and uncritically are more likely in the long run to be right in their conclusions than those who try to test the opinions of the ex-

Authority in Religion

pert by their own judgment?" "Do we not, after all, accept the verdict of the physician or the surgeon when we are ill and treat them practically as infallible?" "Do we not in engineering, in architecture, in music, trust the expert and sink our judgment in deference to the expert's advice? Is not this really the sensible thing to do? And if in other branches of knowledge, why not in religion, which is the most difficult of all sciences?"

To this criticism I think I should reply that it is doubtless true that most of us are wise to defer to the experience of the expert, and the more sincerely we search after truth the more simply shall we accept the expert advice in preference to that of our own judgment. Nevertheless, it is never a safe condition of things when the expert in any walk of life is left uncriticized by the general judgment of the mass of earnest people of good will. "The best government," said Goethe, "is that which leads people to govern themselves." The establishment of an infallible hierarchy, whether in politics, as in modern Italy, or in medicine, as has tended to be the case in England and the United States, or in regard to the management of the Army or Navy, is, in the long run, not the way in which progress is made. The criti-

Authority in Religion

cism of the average citizen is needed to check the expert, and he must be ready to meet this criticism. And this is abundantly true in religion. "To become as little children" does not mean to accept all that we are told. That is exactly the opposite from the attitude of the healthy normal child, who never ceases to ask for explanations of everything in heaven and earth. It is true that we should never get through our business in life at all if we were not ready to take most things for granted, but unless this criticism of the expert is continually proceeding in the community we shall not readily arrive at the truth, and that bears out the practice of Christ in teaching His followers to judge the expert by the fruits of his actions and not by the authority of his status.

We are then thrown back, not in despair, but in courage and exultation, upon belief in the Divine spirit in man, which will gradually bring us all into agreement in regard to all those things which really concern our eternal welfare, if we really care enough to know, and meanwhile we shall each one of us, if we are sincere followers after truth, have such a measure of certainty as will provide us with such light as we need in our several stations of life.

To some people, to those who cannot tolerate

uncertainty, this prospect will seem gloomy indeed, but to others, to most of us, I hope, a very glorious prospect. It means indeed a serious and life-long struggle to gain hold on truth, and to retain it when we have captured it; but the truths which we have wrung from God, as we wrestle all night with the Angel of Truth, and will not let him go until he tells us his Name, these truths bring with them a certainty and confidence of assurance which no other truths convey.

We are able to say with the people of Samaria: "Now we know, not because of thy saying, for we have heard for ourselves, and know for a certainty that this is indeed the Christ."

II

THE IDEA OF THE INFINITE

THERE is in man something which, so far as we know, is unshared by all other creatures—the strange, haunting experience of incompleteness. However good a man is, as judged by ordinary standards, he is perpetually haunted by this feeling of imperfection. He feels that it would be possible to attain a level of life which he dimly sees to be possible, and which, even when seen from afar, gives him a sense of infinite and poignant satisfaction, and yet he has never consciously *seen* or experienced this state: he could not describe it; but in so far as he is living the life which he feels to be proper to his being, he knows that he is, when he is at his best, approximating to this ideal life for which he so acutely hungers.

And, more remarkable still, the better the man grows, the more insistent becomes the in-

The Idea of the Infinite

tense desire for approximation toward something which he can only describe as "perfect," a more complete manifestation of the life which he is trying to live; and the greater the man grows, the more acute becomes this longing for the infinite. This yearning toward a higher life is one of the deepest and most wonderful notes of human life, and one about which we do not think nearly as deeply as we might, for indeed it is immensely significant.

This dissatisfaction, with its accompanying feeling that we shall one day be satisfied, is experienced along three different lines, no one of which, perhaps, appears in practice in entire isolation, but which can, while we are thinking about them, be conveniently isolated in thought. These are the perfection of Goodness, the perfection of Truth, the perfection of Beauty; and these three ideals, into which we can conveniently analyze our idea of perfection, correspond to three activities of the human mind, the moral sense, the intellectual sense, the esthetic sense.

(1) We have a moral sense which tells us that some actions are good and some bad. We do not necessarily mean when we say that they are good that they are advantageous for me or advantageous for my group—school, church

or nation. I can imagine actions very advantageous for myself, considered as an isolated individual, if such I could be, or very advantageous for the nation or church to which I belong—but I say to myself: “I cannot do this thing because, though it would be of advantage to me, or to the group to which I belong, it cannot be done; it would be better for me or my nation to perish than that this thing should be done.” There is, that is to say, a higher court to which I must bow, to which I owe a higher loyalty than to myself or my group. Nor is it entirely to the good of humanity as a whole that I appeal. “It is expedient,” says the prudent statesman, “that one man die for the people and that the whole nation perish not.” But we might answer: “It would be better for humanity altogether to perish than that one unjust or cruel deed be done.” God’s law is more important than my own welfare. The Jew loved passionately the law of God, and yet had no certainty that he as an individual would ultimately survive to enjoy its triumph. His love of the Law was not primarily based upon a merely selfish hope of personal immortality. “Though He slay me, yet will I put my trust in Him,” is a wonderful expression of the universal validity and worth of moral values,

The Idea of the Infinite

even quite apart from any thought of advantage to the individual.

(2) We have again the conception of *Truth*. We are told that it is very advantageous to people to believe this or that. It may not be true, but it does people good to believe it to be true. We were told that it was of advantage to the nation in time of war to believe in Allied victories, which, in fact, had not occurred; we are often told that it is advantageous for people's moral life to believe the historical truth of religious legends which, in fact, so far as we know, have no historical basis; nor, I think, can we deny that now and again some situation may arise for most of us when we cannot see how great harm can be averted without at least an economy of truth. But, even in such cases, we feel "It is my own infirmity"—we feel a wrong has been committed, and that our own ignorance has sinned against an august ideal. We cannot in the long run ignore the claims of truth without a feeling of shame and distress. To use a phrase which the great Roman Catholic teacher, Friedrich von Hügel, often used, "There is a great difference between that which we would like to be true and that which actually is true"—and we cannot ignore the truth and cheat our consciences without

grave moral and intellectual loss. Here, again, we do not speak the truth, because honesty is the best policy. Very often, so far as the individual or the group is concerned, and so far as our lives in this finite world are concerned, honesty is *not* the best policy. We speak the truth because we have within us a mysterious sense that we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and known.

(3) Again, we have within us a wonderful sense of beauty. We have within us the inextinguishable desire to understand, to create, to unite ourselves with, beauty—that wonderful vision about which Sir Joshua Reynolds said: “The sight never beheld it, nor has the hand expressed it. It is an ideal residing in the breast of the artist, which he is always laboring to impart, and which he dies at last without imparting.”

There is, for all those who have cultivated the love of beauty, a sense of shame and wrong whenever we fail to make life an expression of beauty (quite apart from, though not in opposition to, morality), so acute, so desolating, that it again bears witness to an unseen, unrealized ideal, which has a real existence outside ourselves and altogether apart from our immediate ends.

The Idea of the Infinite

Most people feel sympathy with, and understanding of, the desire to do what is *good*, and the shame which follows on *bad* conduct. Many feel some compunction at wrong done against the ideal of intellectual truth, but comparatively few feel the equal shame which those who love beauty feel at listening to bad music or careless, ill-chosen words, or ill-assorted colors or ugly forms. To such people these things are an offense against that unseen Loveliness, which forever haunts us by its presence, and which takes up its dwelling only where the love of beauty is found, whether in the forms of nature or those deliberately created by the piety of those who worship loveliness.

There are, then, three channels—the sense of goodness, of truth, of beauty—through which man reaches forth to an unseen perfection which he never in this life attains, but which is not unknown, seeing that it is felt to come nearer to us in proportion as we live in devotion to these deep instincts of the human heart. We never in this world reach it, but we do know what acts and thoughts bring us nearer to it.

And, furthermore, we can see that, unless there were this feeling of reaching forth to an ideal only with extreme difficulty realizable, there would be no greatness in man at all. It

Authority in Religion

is not man's desire for good which creates the ideal of Goodness, any more than it is his love of beauty which creates Beauty. The opposite of this is the truth. Without this sense of the *reality* of the Infinite those partial approximations toward the ideal would never occur at all. It is the infinite loveliness which draws us to it, and not our love of beauty which brings into being the infinite loveliness. We love beauty because beauty first loved us.

For these ideals, even if they were unattainable by us, even if we were to be totally extinguished at death, we might well be content to live. It would be far better for our happiness, and for what we know as the nobility of life, that we should sink to eternal oblivion or to the depths of hell, striving to realize these ideals, and believing in their objective existence, than that we should live forever in any heaven in which they had no place. "Living for ever and ever" in a heaven in which goodness and truth and beauty were absent would be indeed to die eternally.

That is abundantly true, and it is needful to remind ourselves of it from time to time. We cannot love Perfection because it pays, or we shall never find Perfection at all. It will continually elude us. The artist who writes or

The Idea of the Infinite

plays or paints because he wants admiration or riches, will never do his work well; the man who wants to be good because he will by thus doing "go to heaven," will not be a good man: he will be a time-server, to however remote a period he is willing to defer the wages of his morality.

Yet, if this universe is rational at all, we cannot believe that these ideals do not concern our welfare, that they are false lights, and that these deep longings of the human heart are destined to frustration. . . . "That our ideals themselves should perish," said James Hutchinson Stirling, "that nothing worth existing should have any pledge of continuance or growth, that the world of values, in short, should bear no relation to the world of facts—that is the one intolerable conclusion. And just because its intolerableness has nothing to do with any private hopes or fears, we feel that the refusal to entertain it is a judgment of objective validity, that it is, in short, of the same texture as the inability to believe an intellectual contradiction."¹

If we believe at all that life is rational, that man, not this or that isolated or eccentric in-

¹ "James Hutchinson Stirling, His Life and Work," p. 251. Quoted by Pringle-Pattison in "The Idea of God," p. 45.

dividual, but man as a whole, has a sense of acute need that is crying out for a predestined fulfilment—and without such a belief the whole of life seems totally without meaning—then surely we must believe that the sense so wide, so general, so acute, so unquenchable by endless disappointment, of a beauty and goodness which are the most real of all realities, the *ground* of our own imperfect lives, and the ultimate end and satisfaction of our living, that this sense cannot be frustrated, but that some perfect and infinite life is the source as well as the goal of our own existence, that in it we live and move and have our being; that of it, and in it, and unto it are all things.

Is this great Reality behind our lives and behind nature, which gives us at the same time the sense of perfection and the sense of our own imperfection; is this great Reality “He” or “It”? Is it a force or is it a “person”? Not certainly *a* person, for clearly it is something which is the ground of *all* life. If A or B perished and ceased to be, the world would not be greatly altered, but if this Force itself for one instant ceased to be, the whole world would dissolve into nothingness. Not for one instant could we remain in life, if this *ground* of our common being could conceivably cease to be.

The Idea of the Infinite

So clearly we cannot describe this Reality as "a person." It is a choice between "Personality" and "Force or Principle." To many people it is much easier to conceive of this Reality as Force, and so indeed it is. The Ground of things, the Ideal which is perpetually creating life as we know it, must be the greatest of all forces. It must also indeed be the supreme Principle or Law of being. The *principle* of beauty, of goodness, of truth, is indeed one way of describing God, and where people have been taught that this Ground of our being was a sort of Oriental sultan, or an aged and sentimental parent, or a super-detective, or a police magistrate, it is very understandable that they should, in their revulsion from these crude ideas, object to any description of the great Reality which introduces human categories.

Yet it speak "Force" or "Principle" is an abstract way of speaking which has no real basis in our own experience of life. "Force," when not controlled by personality, is a wasteful and incompetent controller of life. "Nature," with man left out of it, is at best a sub-rational and blundering creator of life and beauty. "Principles of life" are only made known to us in relation to reasoning beings. "Laws of beauty" have no meaning apart from

Authority in Religion

human understanding. There are no colors in the rainbow, no sound from the organ, unless a human eye and ear are there to perceive them. It is only where personality comes upon the scene that we can see "blind" force become purposeful energy, and "laws" of nature becoming sure and rational in their working.

Personality is the highest and most rational force which we know: there may, for all we know, be forces still greater: but, for *us* it is the highest; and therefore, however true it may be, and probably is, that in the great Reality to which our present life bears witness, there is much that is far beyond any idea of "person" that we can know, yet there is no *more* adequate description of supreme reality than to say that it is the personality of which we have imperfect glimpses and adumbrations in our own personal life. So let us advance boldly and say, "in Him we live and move and have our being. In Him is life; of Him, and in Him, and unto Him are all things." Not only the "it" in me—the instincts, the emotions, the fears, and hopes—can commune with Reality, but all those higher loves and thoughts and inspirations which make people call me "him" and not merely "it." I, a person, can commune with Reality, who is therefore

The Idea of the Infinite

the Personality in all men, my Creator, my friend, my life, my eternal home.

We have considered, so far, how our sense of imperfection witnesses to a Perfection, the search for which is the ground of our longings: we have seen that the fact that life only becomes noble when we are striving after this Perfection is a ground for supposing that this Perfection is not merely an unrealizable dream, but the goal as well as the cause of our life, and finally that this Perfection is more truly called Personality than mere Force, or Principle, or Mechanism.

Now let us consider what Jesus Christ believed about this power behind human life which we call God.

In the narrative of the Temptation, whether we treat it as a literal occurrence or as a piece of symbolic narration, we see the struggle which Jesus underwent at the very outset of life between the desire to work for His own personal ends and the desire to carry out at all costs the will of the Universe, which we call God. He had the natural desire of all men, especially of all really good and efficient and great men, to stamp the world with the impress of His own personality. He wished to make the world subserve His own designs. He wished to strike con-

viction into men, and dominate their personalities by His 'own. He was desirous of making bread from stones, and so gaining an immediate and emphatic hold on men's attention, of using the lusts of mankind as a lever wherewith to rule them (to gain the kingship of the world through the help of the evil one), and to use the superstitions of the multitude as a ladder by which to dominate their religious beliefs. Why should not He do so much good by the shortest and easiest way? He knew that He was a natural king among men. It would be greatly to their advantage to acknowledge it. Then why not make them do it quickly, even if it involved a certain hoodwinking of these foolish people for their own obvious good? And then He learnt that man is not here to do his own will, but the will of that unseen Power which he serves. He may not gain power by being disloyal to the nature and purpose of God. Man is, before all other things, a son of God, who shares the Divine nature, and is made capable of coöperating in the Divine purpose, and no lesser good which he can achieve by independent and wayward actions can compensate for his being outside the main purpose of God. Man must act always as a son; a grown son indeed, one who can act intelligently, but still a son. This ulti-

The Idea of the Infinite

mate Perfection is as a father who seeks recognition and love and understanding from his children. And so Jesus conquers the temptation to act arbitrarily, even if such action should quickly secure a desirable end, if such action were outside the range of God's purpose: it is more important to be a loyal son than to achieve a quick success.

Once more, He sees that this world does not, *in its present state*, manifest the ends for which it was designed. He sees, as the artist sees, an invisible beauty which this world does not now express, but which it is capable of expressing. As the world now is, it is the expression of a will only partially subservient to the Divine purpose, and partly it expresses a will definitely hostile to the purpose of God. It requires redemption: it has to be recast, and its elements recombined into a new mold. The Kingdom of Heaven is to be fashioned upon earth, and out of the same elements which are now being used for other purposes, and this can only be done at great cost and by those who are baptized into a new spiritual outlook. He saw that only the things which are good and beautiful and true have permanent validity and represent God's purpose; and all else is temporary and lacking in foundation—

Authority in Religion

That Nothing hath a natural right to last
But equity and reason: that all else
Meets foes irreconcilable, and at best
Lives only by variety of disease.

No structure, however imposing, has any permanence or value that is not built upon the rock of Truth. Only in Truth could man abide and find his home—

Whether we be young or old
Our destiny, our nature and our home
Is with infinitude, and only there;
With hope it is, hope that can never die,
Effort and expectation and desire
And something evermore about to be.

Thus Jesus lived in the kingdom of ideal values: yet with certainty that there is nothing irreconcilable between these values and the nature of this world in which we live. This world is destined to manifest Divine truth, and immediately responds to those who bring God's truth into its present conditions. But though it is true that Jesus identified God only with that which in Nature and Man is beautiful and orderly, and believed that all else was, as it were, a parasitic disease, only gaining a certain semblance of life from the destruction of the

The Idea of the Infinite

true life, yet there is no ground for supposing, as the Christian Scientists teach, that Jesus believed that God knows nothing about sin, disease, or death. It does not follow that because God does not will them that He cannot know of their existence. It is evident that God cares so supremely for the voluntary choice of the good and beautiful by us, that He acquiesces in our making false choices and doing ugly and absurd things rather than that we should be coerced into a lifeless and automatic morality. Evidently goodness is, from God's point of view, a thing deliberately chosen and loved in view of other possible choices. A small good which we have willed and desired is a far greater possession than a magnificent achievement which we have done against our will or through blind following of tradition. Yet because God only desires what is good and wise there is no reason why we should say that He is ignorant of those things which are contrary to goodness and wisdom. A good statesman will not desire murder or theft or war—but he will not be likely to stop these practices if he does not know that they exist, and is ignorant of their nature or the attractiveness which they possess for those who practise them. When our child asks to be allowed not to go to school, or

to be allowed to eat unwholesome but attractive food, our power of helping the child will actually depend upon our being able to understand the point of view which we yet do not share. "Like as a father pitieth his own children, even so is the Lord merciful unto them that fear Him." A father cannot pity the children whose weaknesses and fears he does not know or understand. To say that God has no responsibility for, or knowledge of, this world of matter, of time and space, would make Him powerless to help us who labor under these restrictions, or obsessions (if so they be). If God knows not evil, He could not come into the world to redeem us from it, for we cannot rescue a person from a danger that we do not know to exist. Thus God is separated from all sympathy with our own experiences in time and space: there could be no joy in heaven over the sinner who repents, if there were no sorrow while he was still impenitent. The fear of involving God in the temporal process reduces the whole of man's experiences in time to the level of a nightmare, and the whole process of Divine redemption becomes a delusion. "The finite world, as centred in finite spirits, is not to be regarded as a mere appearance, existing only

The Idea of the Infinite

from the finite point of view: it is metaphysically real, as founded in the nature of God Himself" (Pringle-Pattison, "The Idea of God," p. 414). There is no reason to speak of matter, or life expressed in matter, as either unreal or contrary to the life of spirit. The "Christian Science" tenet, "Matter never manifests Spirit," is surely manifestly untrue. The truth is that, in our present stage of evolution, we never come across Spirit, or have any cognizance of Spirit, except through matter, and our whole moral and esthetic education in this world consists in our effort to express Spirit in terms of matter.

There must be then a very real sense in which the Divine purpose is being expressed, and the Divine life lived, in terms of time and space. "God so loved the world," "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," "That which we have seen and heard, that which our hands have handled, of the Word of Life"—all these are phrases to impress upon us powerfully the reality of God's life in and through this temporal and material life, and not only in a timeless and spaceless infinite. We are to understand clearly in such phrases that this temporal world is potentially, though not as yet actually,

Authority in Religion

within the life of God, evolving and becoming self-conscious and responsible to the Eternal Will.

So we conceive of the Divine purpose expressing itself in time, and through the forms of material life—suffering, growing, learning, dying, and rising again through death—not only in the life of Jesus, but through the whole complex of human life. This is one aspect of the life of God, that aspect which we call His Sonship.

But also we must conceive of God with His purpose planned and understood and complete in eternity: and this aspect of God's being is His Fatherhood. As eternal, He cannot suffer as we suffer, for He knows the end of all things and knows that it is good. His pain, if pain there be, is the pain of sympathy with an imperfect outlook, with our ignorance and mistakes, and not the pain of experiencing Himself our ignorance and sin. So we seem compelled to think of God in a double capacity, as the eternal self-subsistent Ground and Creator of life, and as that Life itself being made flesh, subject to temporal conditions, and returning with all the wealth of gathered experience into the joy of Eternity. This double life, as we conceive it, of God, we call His transcendence

The Idea of the Infinite

and His immanence. In Christian theology it is expressed by saying that God is both Father and Son, that the virtues of origination, and the no less beautiful virtues of courageous faith, and filial love, and patient suffering, are alike Divine. Fatherhood is God and Sonship is God, and yet not two gods but one God. But this twofold life of God, by which God expresses Himself in this temporal Universe, does not mean that there was once a time when God did *not* love and had *no* Son, and there was *no* Creation. God's paternity and His Sonship and His creativeness are alike eternal. Creation has always been, it is still going on: it will never be completed.

The love which created the world, the love which dies to redeem the world, is no active interlude in a quiescent Divine life of eternal meditation: God loves and works and begets the Son eternally.

And again, this eternal expression of God in the world, this Eternal Son growing and becoming conscious of Sonship, generates through the mutual love of the Father and the Son, the Spirit, which is the life of God becoming conscious and active in creation; it is the love of the Father for the Son, and the Son for the Father, the product of Creative and filial love

Authority in Religion

returning in active love to its Source. And in these three eternal manifestations of Divine Life, we find all life consisting. The musician is conscious of eternal music: this he himself embodies by his filial devotion to what he hears, and through his filial devotion the song, a *new* song, arises and is sung in the ears of God. The thinker listens with filial love to the great eternal source of thought, and through his devotion and sincerity is born true thought, the Spirit of the Father made available through the love of the Son.

Kabir, the Indian poet, says:

The seed is in the plant, as the shade is in the tree, as the void is in the sky, as infinite forms are in the void.

The creature is in God, and God in the creature: they are ever distinct, and ever united. He Himself is the tree, the seed, and the germ. He Himself is the flower, the fruit, and the shade. He Himself is the sun, the light, and the illuminated One. He is the breath, the word, and the meaning.

More than all else do I cherish at heart that love which makes me to live a limitless life in this world.

It is like the lotus, which lives in the water and blooms in the water: yet the water cannot touch its petals, they open beyond its reach.

The Idea of the Infinite

So in this world of time and space our limited souls cry out for the limitless God; our hearts, hungry for beauty, cry out for the imperishable loveliness, and our sin-stained souls for the One who is wholly good—and in this very hunger of the soul, which nothing in this world can entirely appease, is the promise and assurance that He who created the hunger will give us the food, and that food nothing short of His own Life.

III

THE NATURE OF MAN

THERE are, I suppose, few thoughtful persons now who doubt that the bodily structure of man (including all the machinery of the brain, by means of which his mind alone can become known to us) has gradually evolved through the course of millions of ages from the simplest and most rudimentary forms of material structure.

We say the "*bodily structure* of man," since it does not follow necessarily that man, the spirit, has so evolved because the material structure through which he manifests himself on this earth has evolved in this way. It is at least a conceivable theory, and one which fits in with many facts, that man, the spirit, is like the musician whose instrument the body is. The musician may be gradually fashioning for himself a perfect instrument for his self-expression, but because the player is getting a more and more perfect instrument, that does not mean

The Nature of Man

that the musician is getting a better musician. He is able to play better, it is true; but not because he is a better musician, but because he has developed a better instrument through which to make himself known to us.

So I think we must always remember that when we speak of man gradually evolving through simpler to more complicated structures of body, we are only really dealing with the mechanism through which man expresses himself, and not, so far as we know, with the unseen spiritual idea itself. So Mr. Needham, of Cambridge, reminds us in "Science, Religion, and Reality":

For although all living organisms are to be considered as physico-chemical systems, yet at the same time they are, as it were, musical instruments, the keys of which are in all cases played by something, however meagre in mental development it may be. This form of animism is in every way compatible with physico-chemical research, for although nobody denies that man is a thinking, willing, feeling creature, yet that does not hinder the mechanistic explanation of such things as the laws of growth and the process of acidity-regulation of his circulatory fluids.

Our first point then is this, that when we think of man, we are considering a spiritual

idea, which we know, indeed, only through messages which we receive through his, and our, material organs, but we have no more reason to say that he is *in* these material organs which we call bodies than we should have for saying that a man who rang us up on the telephone is *in* the telephone.

Our second point is this. Man's bodily and visible structure, which has so gradually evolved, appears to be evolving, not haphazard but in a *purposeful* way, toward the production of ends which are greater than are necessary for the immediate needs of the mind of which they are the expression. It is exceedingly difficult for us to see how the first beginnings of beauty can have been of any use whatever to the primitive bird or flower. There is no reason to suppose that the female had need of any elaborate beauty to aid her in finding a mate, or that the bee needed any superlative degree of beauty in the flower to attract it to fertilizing the flower—a little color and a strong smell would have been quite enough; a concentration of effort on the production of elaborate plumage or song would seem to have been, as we would imagine, a positive disadvantage in the struggle for existence, unless indeed the organism is looking forward altogether beyond its

The Nature of Man

immediate needs to an ideal of beauty in which it takes a wholly unselfish delight. So General Smuts remarks:

Everywhere we see the great overplus of the whole. So little is asked; so much more is given. The female only asks for a sign to recognise the male, and to help her to select him and stick to him in preference to others. And for answer she gets an overpowering revelation of beauty out of all proportion to her modest request. The peahen has no discriminating understanding of the wondrous color of the peacock, which far transcends even our human powers; but in some inscrutable way something of an emotional nature in her takes it all in and is satisfied. It is deep calling unto deep; it is the whole appealing to the whole. There is evidently more in all this than the Darwinian factors can satisfactorily explain, and it would be both foolish and unscientific not to recognise this frankly.¹

There appears to be in the humblest organism, those which appear to have nothing but the most rudimentary instinct, some force of anticipation, as though they could foresee some far-off and beautiful end to which their one humble life was predestined to serve, and the

¹ "Holism," by General Smuts.

Authority in Religion

little mind sets to work to accumulate, generation after generation, all those small variations which will in the end subserve the purposes of this far-off, and as yet non-existent, being, and to cut off all variations which would hinder this evolution. These humble beings, like the patriarchs of the Old Testament, "all died in faith, not having received the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that we without them should not be made perfect."

There is all the difference in the world between that idea of evolution which is called teleological, i.e., which has the final end in view through all its changes, and is working toward that end, and the view of evolution which supposes the production of the elaborate life which we know around us to be based upon a chapter of fortunate accidents, as though the play of *Hamlet* had been produced by all the schools in England setting themselves to play with the letters of the alphabet, and one having accidentally hit upon that arrangement which finally produced the play. And this idea that the progress of life toward the production of the human body and the associated mental structure has been the result of a series of fortunate accidents seems really more incredible than the most foolish of the myths of popular religion. The in-

infinitesimal variations which have led in the course of thousands of years to wonderful results have not been variations which, so far as we know, have been immediately beneficial to the individual. They seem to have survived because they were helping to produce an infinitely more complex structure which was not even to come upon the horizon for myriads of years. Thus we conceive of evolution as prophetic, varying constantly toward the production of a whole which the parts at present cannot see or understand.

This is the view of evolution which General Smuts calls Holism, the Whole being always in the part, the great complex, highly developed being having its life always implicitly within the humble organisms, and leading them along in their development toward the manifestation of its purpose.

Now this purpose in nature is toward the incarnation of a certain, well-defined character, in this life of time and space, toward the production of *human values*. Nature tends to group its life round man, and to serve his purposes. We say this, not, we believe, merely because we are men, and admire that which is good for our own species, but because we seem to see nature itself attaining its ideal beauty most surely

Authority in Religion

when it is ruled by man. Nature, untended and unregulated by man, is not in itself beautiful. It seems to wait in expectation—"waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God"—finding its fulfilment in the fulfilment of the nature of man.

We cannot suppose for a moment that man, *as he now is*, is the fulfilment of the purpose of nature. Man is acutely conscious that this is not so, nor do the lowest forms of life (as we count them) find their fulfilment in man at the level he has now reached.

Man is, we feel, evolving with incredible difficulty and pain toward a higher form of life, in which Truth, Goodness and Beauty will be more perfectly manifested than they are to-day. And this process of the incarnation of the great values in human life, has, we feel, already partially been fulfilled in the life of Christ. He is the head, of which the whole regenerated human race is the body; He is the stem of which we are the branches. In Him this incarnation of the higher values in man has been begun; in His life and teaching the evolving purpose of God took a great leap forward; in the progressive appropriation of His spirit by the human race this incarnation will be completed. His life is the symbol to us of the eternal process of evolu-

tion, toward a deliberately conceived and incomparably good purpose.

This gradual subduing of nature to a deliberately conceived purpose is carried on by man through *interference* with nature, and not simply by letting nature have her own way. We discriminate between the plants which nature so freely sows around our houses: we call some weeds. By a weed we mean a plant unwanted for our purposes; and we proceed to eliminate it without mercy. So with animals: in our country there were once wolves and bears, wild boars and venomous serpents. These animals were provided by nature quite as truly as cows and sheep. But we have labeled them as pests, because they no longer serve our purposes, and civilization has only become possible by their destruction. So again nature has given us as our near neighbors the germs of typhus and leprosy, small-pox and plague, and we have destroyed as far as we can these our humble brothers. So human life goes forward by the purposeful interference with nature; and it is certain, I think, that by means of eugenics, and by the subjugation of natural human instincts to deliberate control and regulation, we shall alone be able to produce a higher type of mental and physical fitness, and eliminate the human

and animal types which retard what we believe to be the ultimate purpose of our race.

And that which is true of external nature, that we progress by the deliberate elimination of some types and the deliberate encouragement of others, is true also of our own nature within. We have within us a multitude of wild passions, all alike claiming a right to live, and in themselves incompatible. So long as we grant to them all the equal right to flourish in our hearts, we are in the strictest sense of the word "dissolute"—we are all in pieces. We attain moral progress by the deliberate training, pruning and, in some cases, eliminating, these natural passions, giving weight and encouragement to some and starving and thinning out others; and so, again, by *interference* with nature, we attain to nature's true end, as we believe it to be.

It is a difficulty, and must always have been a difficulty, to man, since he began to think at all, that these high ends should be accomplished only through so much failure and pain. Why cannot the victory be gained except after a battle whose field is strewn with the corpses of the slain? Why is there such incredible suffering—not perhaps so much among animals and insects, for it seems certain that among them the joy of living infinitely outweighs the

momentarily-felt pain of bereavement, mutilation, and death—among human beings, whose griefs are infinitely extended by the memory of the past and the sad anticipation of the future? Why is it all necessary? And the only answer is that we do not know. We do not know enough to make us confident that, considering the general course of the world, our own experience, and that of the men and women whose lives we most respect, good *is* being on the large scale worked out (and this deepening assurance is the verdict of many whose lives have been from the world's point of view records of unbroken failure): we feel that a theory of the world based on the belief in the gradual production of moral values is more in accordance with facts than any other, though it is not without grave difficulties; and we take it as an hypothesis on which to live our lives, to be tested by its results. And we find that, as a working hypothesis, it is justified. The men and women who take life, with all its ups and downs, its pleasures and its pains, as a means of producing character and creating beauty, often, greatly to one's surprise, are justified by the result.

Such a theory as this works in practice. It cannot, I think, be *proved* in any other way than by trying it. And still the problem of the pain,

and the many failures, so far as we can judge, remains. But we have to realize that we see the process in the working, and not in its final result. No process looks beautiful in its intermediate stages—a picture, however beautiful in the end, is not beautiful to the onlooker in its incomplete form; a human embryo gives no anticipation of the beauty of the human developed body. And we see only the *process* of life going on. It is at times ugly enough, to our vision, almost to warrant us in supposing that no picture is being produced at all, that life is nothing but a stupid and cruel chapter of accidents, producing nothing of value or beauty. And perhaps we try the experiment of acting on such an hypothesis of supposing that there is no purpose in life, and so that no actions are better or worse than others. And we always end in finding that this hypothesis is still more hopeless. It *does* matter how we live: there *is* a real distinction between good and bad, beautiful and ugly; pain *is* worth enduring; there *is* in the end, if not a certainty, at least a haunting anticipation that life will justify its purpose, that we are treading a *road* which leads to some definite destination, and not merely walking about aimlessly in a circle.

The Nature of Man

And so Christianity puts before us for our acceptance, not a series of philosophical propositions but a record of a life of which the center is a cross. That life of Jesus is a *symbol* of the hope and faith upon which humanity alone can rest. It is the life of the holiest of the sons of men, uniting in Himself all those values of which we feel most sure and certain in life. It is the record of one who believed in the ultimate Good, and in our close relationship to it; of one who lived only for that Good; who died in shame and failure and agony, and (if we believe the earliest record) with only one word on His lips, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" and yet a record of One who more surely lives and reigns to-day than any of us, who have never gone through the experience of death, as He did.

It is a record embodying the utmost tragedy of human existence, and yet it is amazing in its testimony to the worth of pain and the triumph of failure. None can doubt the depths of the suffering and failure; and none can doubt its unique value for the uplifting of the human race. And the Christian religion does not say, "The record of this life removes all difficulties from your path"—it says: "Here are all your difficulties in their most acute form: look at

them well: plant the remembrance of them on every altar and wherever you pray or work: never ignore them: meet them, and look them straight in the face; and consider what it all means"—and you will be content to believe, in face of that story, and of all the tragic stories of which that one is the supreme symbol, that the solution of the strange mystery at the heart of our lives is most easily found in the belief that there *is* a purpose of Good in this world, and that it *is* in process of achievement, through the pains, and failures, and faithful perseverance of mankind.

General Smuts, after all his experience of the Great War, and the subsequent "Peace," can say:

In spite of all appearances to the contrary, eventual victory is serenely and securely waiting, and the immeasurable sacrifices have not been made in vain. The groaning and travailing of the universe is never aimless or resultless. Its profound labours mean new creation, the slow, painful birth of wholes, of new and higher wholes, and the slow but steady realisation of the Good which all the wholes of the universe in their various grades dimly yearn and strive for. It is the nature of the universe to strive for, and slowly, but in ever-increasing measure, to attain, wholeness, fullness,

The Nature of Man

blessedness. The real defeat for men as for other grades of the universe would be to ease the pain by a cessation of effort, to cease from striving towards the Good.¹

We believe then that the purpose of the Universe is directed toward producing those values of which the best human lives that we know are examples, or rather anticipations. It is along such lines as these that we believe that the universe will advance.

And if any one asks us why we believe that human life is higher than any other kind of life, whether, for instance, a walrus might not believe that the walrus type of life and walrus values were the highest and best, our answer would be that, so far as we know, neither the walrus nor any other known being except man thinks at all about values or about final ends; and it is just because man alone in creation is consciously troubled in his being by the insistent desire to work to a foreseen end, and is consciously adapting himself and external nature toward that end, that we believe him to be greater and better than any other living being in the universe, and the progress of all nature involved in his victory or defeat.

¹ "Holism," p. 344.

Authority in Religion

St. Paul says that the whole creation is groaning and travailing together in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God. By "the sons of God" we must understand beings who share the nature and understand the purposes of God and are able thus to coöperate deliberately and consciously with His purposes. Nature itself is waiting for its redemption from "vanity" or purposelessness; it drifts along without deliberate aim until there rises this newer type of life, the deliberate coöperation of the "sons of God" with the understood purpose of the Eternal Father.

The "sons of God" then are those men and women who are working deliberately toward a realized goal. They have an ideal of complete wholeness, or health, called, in our English version of the Bible, "salvation."

Now what is involved in this ideal of complete health or salvation of the sons of God, of those who aim at a complete expression in terms of human life of the will and nature of God?

(1) First, it will involve health of body—"first that which is natural." Christ laid great stress upon the importance and normality of bodily health. The Divine character of the sons of God can only be fully manifested upon earth through clean and vigorous bodies. Physical

health is largely a corporate attainment, and no individual can wholly emancipate himself from the corporate level of attainment. Physical health is the expression of the corporate thought of the race. Typhus and plague, leprosy and infant-mortality, cholera and small-pox, were physical symbols and manifestations of the corporate thought of the race. They flourish where the mind is still bestial: where the mind of the pig-sty is left behind these diseases cannot flourish. As soon as it is realized by the corporate mind that such diseases are not inevitable, are not involved in the purpose of God for human advancement, a deliberate crusade is taken up against these diseases, and the corporate endeavor of men, instead of being occupied in the rescue of Christ's tomb from the Saracens, occupies itself in the great crusade to rescue the animate temple of Christ, the human body, from the invasions and desecration of disease. This will be done first by a change of mental attitude, a "conversion," a new belief that disease mars the perfection of God's work, and is the cause of most of the crime and uncontrolled bestiality in the world, and therefore can and should be eliminated, and then by detailed scientific researches we shall proceed to remove the proximate material causes of dis-

Authority in Religion

ease. Thus change of mind and scientific research work hand in hand.

One of the most striking results of the modern developments of our knowledge concerning the influence of mental factors in disease is that they are bringing back medicine in some measure to that coöperation with religion which existed in the early stages of human progress (Rivers, "Medicine, Magic, and Religion," p. 144).

Yet even when the corporate mind is still unchanged or only partially changed, the individual can very largely by his own change of outlook overcome disease. The actual healing of disease depends partly upon the removal of the actual material causes of disease (which will never be effectually done until disease is recognized as a definite enemy) and partly by the resistance which the sick man can put up against the disease when he is actually attacked. This resistance will partly depend upon material factors, such as good food, warmth, rest, and so on. But largely it will depend upon freedom from anxiety, from despondency, from anger, from jealousy, and, above all, from fear; in a word, from those sinful and anti-social thoughts which depress vitality and actually poison and depress the functions of the body.

The Nature of Man

The "sons of God," those who are living habitually and consciously in line with the purposes of the Father, and are, at the same time, facing wisely the actual material situation, and not neglecting or despising the physical factors in disease, will tend to be able to keep their bodies in such health as will most clearly demonstrate in this life the will of the universe toward abundant life.

The necessity of an increasing coöperation between mental and physical factors in curing disease is emphasized by one of our greatest modern psychologists in these words:

If medicine is to maintain its hold on certain aspects of disease which should properly come within its sphere, it must find that it has much to learn from the priest, if indeed, some kind of collaboration between the two is not often desirable. . . .

The study of the latest phases of the history of medicine shows us a limit to the increasing specialisation of function as a character of social evolution. The relations which seem to be coming into existence between medicine and religion resemble in some degree those which we have seen to characterise the early phases of religion. They differ chiefly in that the later phase recognises explicitly, and is learning to understand, a set of

Authority in Religion

convictions which were once allowed to play their part unregarded and unstudied. In the domain of the medicine of the mind—and its scope is far wider than is usually supposed—the course of history seems to be showing us that the close interdependence of different departments of human culture will be just as much a character of its latest and its highest phase, as it was characteristic of its earliest and its lowest (Rivers, “Medicine, Magic, and Religion,” pp. 116, 117).

But this physical health, while it is in itself a real important end to be pursued, is never to be pursued at the cost of mental health. To be a gladiator or a prize-fighter, without any mental interests, with no purpose beyond those of the human animal, is not in reality to be a healthy human being at all. It would be better, if one is forced to choose, to be strong in mind and weak or diseased in body, than to be strong in body and feeble in mind. These two sorts of health are not indeed incompatible: in general, each helps the other; but there are some cases where a man cannot pursue his mental life without neglect of the body. And where that is so he does well to choose to nurture the mind even to the neglect of the body. It may even be the case that a careful and scientific culture of the body, going along with a systematic neglect

The Nature of Man

of the mind, would be actively harmful. Physical health, uncontrolled by mind, may work more certain destruction in the world than a comparatively untended body equally uncontrolled.

And beyond the health of the mind there is that still deeper layer of health, that health which consists not merely in having mental and physical strength to do one's own job in life, but the spiritual insight which enables a man to be in profound and constant touch with the Power behind life. This is his deepest need; and sometimes, to achieve it, he is obliged to let go of the less important forms of health, to cut off the hand, to pluck the eye, in the larger interests of the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless, he will in general achieve most when he is able, both in body and in mind and in spirit, to offer an all-round complete life as a living sacrifice without blemish to God.

In medieval times, the spiritual factors in health were so much over-stressed that material factors were neglected and despised, and the result was that the world was ravaged with disease. The growth of medical science happily drew men's attention to the actual proximate causes of disease, and the result has been a most striking and marvelous lessening of mortality and illness. In our day we are becoming

Authority in Religion

once more impressed by the limits of the power of healing by merely physical processes, and are once again investigating those striking powers which Christ used, and which others before his time had used, the power of faith in the purpose of God to control the functioning of the body, to give immunity to infection, and to stimulate resistance to the onset of disease. Let us hope that in our renewed interest in this side of healing we may not make the great mistake which our medieval ancestors made, of neglecting the material factors. It is a great principle of the Christian religion that there is no antithesis between the spirit and the flesh, between matter and spirit. Matter is spirit in process of evolution; flesh is the organ of the manifestation of the spirit in terms of this temporal universe.

We do not now believe that God violently interposes to rescue certain individuals from the ordinary processes of life. We do not now believe, as the Jews used to believe, that a good man, thrown into a den of lions, will not, because he is good, be eaten, or if he is thrown into a furnace, will not be burnt. The whole doctrine of the Cross implies the opposite belief. Christ did not come down from the cross—therefore the Jews would not believe in Him.

They had been taught that immunity from suffering was the sign of Divine approval. We have now learnt that God saves us *by* the cross and not always *from* the cross. God sends rain upon the just and the unjust. In a war, as many good and faithful men perish as godless and careless men. There is no promise that God will violently intervene to save the godly; but He does teach us, if we are willing to learn, how we can so order the world that wars and pestilences, and lions and tigers, shall cease to be, and He does teach us how to keep ourselves in such peace and faith that, where it is possible, we may often be untouched in situations where otherwise we might perish; and where that is not possible we meet the disaster without fear, and, knowing that, it will cease to be a disaster when it is taken up into the understood purpose of God for our lives.

So man, tending upward toward the mind of Christ, learns to move mountains, and to walk on stormy seas, and reaches out to a condition, at present only dimly discerned, when this material world and our material bodies will become the perfect vehicles of spirit, and will express perfectly and without strain and anguish the perfect mind of God for the universe which He is still creating.

IV

PRAYER, MAGIC AND SCIENCE

IF we believe that this world is a manifestation of an inconceivably great invisible Reality, and that it is of the nature of man that he should coöperate with the purposes which this Reality is manifesting—or, in the language of religion, that man is a “son of God,” intended to coöperate with a God whom he can understand—then it follows that man will try, in some way or other, to learn God’s language; and that he will have the capacity, in some measure or other, of learning it, and will be able to make his needs understood by God, and will be able to hear God’s voice. This is what we mean by Prayer—it is the raising of our minds to comprehend the Divine Being, whose offspring we believe we are.

We are accustomed to regard God as the one being who never changes, who knows everything, and who consequently can never be told anything that He has not heard before. This is

Prayer, Magic and Science

a rather barren and dreadful idea of God. We imagine Him constantly being bombarded with the repetition of stale news, and meeting forever situations which He has known in every detail from all eternity. It is this idea which makes heaven seem so empty, dull, and void of content. We cannot conceive of God laughing, for every situation has been arranged from all eternity: He can never be sorry, for everything is always for the best: He can never have the delight of seeing things which are new, because everything around Him has been there "before the hills in order stood, or earth received her frame."

This static idea of God, so dull and lifeless, reflects itself in our worship, and accounts for the stuffiness, the somnolence, of our typical religious buildings, ceremonies and personalities. Their boredom is a reflection of the eternal boredom connected with the idea of the unchangeable God.

As against this idea, the Christian religion places, in language which the greatest teachers have always quite frankly recognized as being totally inadequate, the idea of God as a Society, in which there is eternal transaction, as of a father sending his child out into the world, rejoicing at his successes, grieving over his fail-

Authority in Religion

ures, and a son learning and stumbling, and gaining by experience, and bringing back to his father new and real gains and in turn creating perpetually new, and ever more wonderful, expressions of the mind and love which this fellowship of father and son can continually produce by their interchanges of love. We may say that this all sounds very anthropomorphic, that it is a fashioning of God in our own image and likeness; that it is, anyway, very inadequate. And the great Christian teachers would answer you that it *is* doubtless inadequate, but far less so than the idea of the solemn and lonely Being who sits forever enthroned in heaven, forever listening in mournful boredom to the repetition of things which He has everlastingly known, and which are destined to be everlastingly repeated.

For life is not like that. It has in it perpetual surprises, things which make us laugh and cry. We are at our best when we are creating new things; when we fight, and love, are disappointed, and rewarded. And all this, we feel, which is life at its highest intensity, must have its counterpart in God. He must be able to laugh, and to enjoy the act of creating; He must love to see His little children growing up, and must be sorry when they die, and must

Prayer, Magic and Science

know, too, what it is to *be* a little child and to grow up, and to be ignorant, and to gain new knowledge; and this He must have been like *always*, and not merely for the last few thousand years, or since this particular planet was created. Now, if we believe all this, we shall believe that man, having within him the nature of God, must have a capacity, and with it an intense anxiety, to communicate with God. He can hear with delight the voice of God, and he can give delight to God, a new and intense delight, which God has not experienced before, by telling his needs and his pleasures to God. We believe in fact that Reality is pulsating with new, intense and passionate experiences.

Let this, at all events, be our hypothesis, to be verified by experience. And surely we *do* find it to be verified by experience. We do find that those who take time to talk to God, who believe that God likes them, and enjoys talking to them, those who relate the passing experiences of each day with their deepest experiences of eternity, those who are troubled in heart and conscience if they think they have hurt God, or disappointed Him; those who, in a word, treat God as though He were the most human and most lovable of beings, are those who are able best to transfuse the happenings of this mutable

Authority in Religion

world with the rich color and music of eternity.

Prayer then is, first, and in its most simple aspect, the practice, founded on a belief in the approachability of God, of telling God what deeply concerns us, and asking Him to give us the things we feel we need. This means, even in its most primitive and simple forms, that the eternal factor is made immanent in the daily life of the phenomenal world. The girl tells God how much she wants a new hat; that she feels that to have it would make her happy: she asks God simply to give it to her. If she wants it badly enough she may get it; and it will probably disappoint her belief in the achievement of complete happiness along that path—or she may not get it, in spite of ardent prayers. If she has believed, as so many people believe still, that prayer is an exercise of magic by which we get what we want, an act of compulsion by which we can bend the unseen powers to render obedience to our behests and avert dangers from our path, then she will be disappointed if the hat does not arrive. She will beat her idol, as the savages do; she will give up prayer and become a skeptic, and say she no longer believes in God. “Is not God almighty,” she will say, “and did not I ask Him for so small a thing as a new hat? Did not I

Prayer, Magic and Science

ask over and over again? Did I not give Him praises, and offer sacrifices, do hard, unpleasant things—going to church, and putting money in His plate, both making my communion and trying my hardest to be good? And I haven't *got* my new hat. I don't believe in God any more. I shan't pray to Him again." This is the experience of rudimentary prayer, where it has not yet been distinguished from magic, which aims at getting our own way with the universe by performing ritual acts, charms and spells. It is still extraordinarily common. We have altered the forms of magic, but we still believe in the power of the spell to control and coerce God.

But if the girl is wise, and if she has come to know anything of the Christian view of prayer, she says to herself, "After all, if God is the Father not only of me but of all mankind, I am willing to believe that the universal needs of mankind may be inconsistent with my having a new hat. I have no right to put my needs on a higher level than those of the rest of mankind. If God is my Father, and also other people's Father as well, He *ought* not to give me private and special terms which He does not give to others.

"Again, it is just possible, in fact I begin to

see that it is probable, that there are other things besides the new hat which might make me happy. In wanting a new hat I really want 'beauty,' not merely something to cover my head; and beauty, which is another word for God, can be given in other ways. The hat is indeed a sacrament of beauty, an outward expression for my need for God, but not the only, or the best conceivable, sacrament of beauty.

"And, once more, it may be quite right that I should have the new hat, but possibly I am intended to earn it for myself and not to get it given me. And when I have earned it, then I can have it, if by that time I haven't found anything I want more."

And if this girl can see so far as this, then she won't lose her belief in God or in prayer, but it will be immensely deepened. She will see that prayer is not only, or mainly, a method of squeezing things out of God, of using Him as a means to get our own ends, but it is in its essence a means of discovering what God wants *us* to do and be; it is an exploration of the nature and purposes of God. Prayer then becomes a far more exciting and absorbing activity. In fact, it has no end, for it is nothing other than the union of the soul with the eternal

purpose of the world. And this is, I think, the radical difference between magic and prayer. Magic is the attempt to use God as the instrument for our purposes; prayer is the attempt to make ourselves instruments for God's purposes.

People often speak of a magical view of the Sacraments. It *is* a reversion to the idea of magic if we believe that we can, by purely material and mechanical manipulations, bring ourselves into communion with God, apart from all moral dispositions, and so alter His disposition to us; but it is not "magic" to believe that material acts—special times, places, colors, buildings, scents and sounds—predispose the soul either to communion with, or enmity toward, God. We cannot compel or bind God down to our purposes by these means, and work our will by subjecting God to these restraints—to believe that *is* to believe in magic; but it is *not* a belief in magic to believe that material things do convey spiritual and eternal truths to those who are spiritually attuned, and that certain collocations of words, notes, colors, stones and other material objects are more provocative of spiritual thoughts than others, and do become charged with spiritual values, which are felt by those who are spirit-

Authority in Religion

ually attuned. You cannot make or produce God by building Him a material temple, but if you love God you will end in expressing your love in terms of matter. We, most of us, approach prayer, as the savage experience of the race has approached prayer, by the pathway of magic: the only tragedy is to revert to that way when we ought to have passed it and outgrown its need.

The benefit of magic to primitive peoples, as Dr. Malinowski has shown us ("Science, Religion, and Reality," pp. 75, 76), has been that it has been a ritual expression of unfulfilled needs, of those hopes and aspirations of man which nature leaves unsatisfied, and it has kept alive the eternal hope that these aspirations will one day be fulfilled. It has been an eternal challenge to God, childish and uncritical indeed, yet not without its value, to produce to man that vindication of the beneficent nature of Reality in which man so passionately believes. It has been also a permanent witness to the belief that the face of this world *can* be altered by human thought and emotion, that we *can* create, transform, destroy, material life through spiritual energy: that spirits, good and bad, are mightier entities than material rivers and mountains, earthquakes and storms. To all

this magic has borne its witness; it has been "A schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," but the need of it ought now to have been outgrown by those who have "the mind of Christ."

In the gradual growth of Natural Science we find an analogy, full of instruction, to the growth of the belief in Prayer. Science has grown through a belief in nature as rational. We believe that nature can be made subservient to the highest needs of man, that those powers which are now maleficent will ultimately be shown to be not hostile, but subservient, to the needs of man. Science has only been made possible by a great act of faith—a faith that we are intended to understand nature and use it: that it is not so unaccountable that we can do nothing more than sit down and "hope for the best." The pioneers of science have been the men who in primitive times have made continual attempts to discover a purpose in nature, even when no purpose has been observable, and have ended by discovering that nature answers to and can fulfil the higher needs and aspirations of man. So the true man of science has been in the highest sense the true man of prayer—not necessarily or perhaps generally the man who has spent most time on his knees, but the man who has spent most time in ex-

pressing his belief in the intelligibility and beneficence of the Divine purposes and the attempt to demonstrate that belief in practice. And the true man of science, again, is not the man who tries to persuade himself that what he would like to have happened has happened—which is the attitude of the superstitious man—but he is the man who is determined to find out what does actually happen in the universe, whether we like it or not. It is indeed doubtful if Science could ever go on, if there were not always in the minds of its votaries a belief that by finding out what *is* true we shall also in the end find out what is beneficent for mankind; but, first and foremost, he aims at finding out what is true.

In this the man of science is like the true man of prayer. He who prays best is the man who wants above all to know how God does in fact act, and not how we should like to think He would act—and very often God “shows His servants bitter things.” Very often the true man of prayer has little else to report than the melancholy truth, “Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself.” This may be, in regard to any particular problem, all that he can honestly report. Yet he never acquiesces in this answer. He is quite sure that an intelligible purpose will

one day be discerned, if not here, yet certainly in some other world.

The man of prayer is not *primarily* concerned, any more than is the man of science, in getting something out of God for his own ends. His primary concern is to find out what God's purpose is for the universe, and that is the "answer to prayer" that he chiefly expects to get. He does also hope to get a light on the solution of his own problems, and he has an underlying faith that by knowing God better he will understand better, and be able to cope better with, his own private problems; but his primary aim is not to get rewards for himself, but to understand the Will of God.

The teaching of Jesus about prayer is extraordinarily in tune with the principles of scientific research. We are not to be *resigned* to the *status quo*. "He that asketh receiveth, he that seeketh findeth, to him that knocketh it shall be opened." We are to be continually investigating, inquiring, demanding an answer, and so only shall we secure results.

We are to have as much determination in our demands for an answer as though we were forcing the hand of an unwilling donor—we are to take as our examples in pertinacity in asking of the man who rouses his friend at mid-

night and compels him, all unwilling, to leave his warm bed to attend to his needs, or the importunate widow who will give the unjust judge no peace until he does her justice. The universe will not yield its secrets to us unless we go on thundering at the doors.

Yet we are not to suppose on this account that we are dealing with a power *unwilling* to grant our requests. God is like a father who would not give his son a stone when he asks for an egg: He is, even more than an earthly father, ready to give good gifts to them that ask Him. "Your heavenly Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask Him." We are not to suppose that we are heard for our much speaking.

Why then, we may ask, should we be told to be so persistent and importunate, if God is "more ready to hear than we to pray, and wont to give more than either we desire or deserve"?

Why do we so often ask for things which seem such obviously *good* things, and fail to get them?

There may, I think, be three reasons.

(1) We may be asking all the time for exclusive benefits for ourselves, which we do not desire to share with others. We ask our Father

to give us things which He must take from others if He is to give them to us; we ask that a thousand may fall beside us, and ten thousand at our right hand, but that the evil may not come nigh *me*—a mean, selfish prayer, which God could not grant without belying His own nature.

(2) Or we may be asking for something the conditions of which we do not understand. We ask to be on the right hand, and on the left, of Christ in His kingdom, but not on the right hand and on the left of His cross. We want to be Christlike *and* comfortable, saintly *and* successful; and very often these desires are incompatible the one with the other. If you desire the end, you must also desire the means. If you want to be with Christ, you must also want to be “near the fire” of adversity. We know not what we ask. We want the prize, but we don’t want the sweat and fatigue of the race.

(3) Or we want something handed over the counter to us, so to speak, which, in its nature, can only be given to those who are prepared to receive it. You cannot give a drink to a man who has no jug or cup to receive it in. You cannot give love or kindness to a man who will not take the trouble to earn it.

But you say: “If I ask for a new heart, so

that I *may* be able to receive the best gifts, why can't I be given it? If I ask for a drink, and haven't got a cup, why can't God *give* me the cup? Why is it apparently made so endlessly difficult to *be* good if God wants us to be good? Why, when we pray for obviously good things, and are ready, so far as we know, to pay whatever the cost may be, up to parting with life itself, is it still made well-nigh impossible to gain our goal?"

Probably the real answer is that goodness is a far more difficult thing to attain than we have any idea of. In asking for it, we imagine that we are asking for something which could easily be given, if God liked to give it. But goodness is probably in its nature only attainable by struggle, and by a very long course of making small and deliberate choices. It is a treasure hid in the field, and we must sell all that we have to buy the field in which the treasure lies hid. It may be, it probably is, true that we are still in the early stages of our ascent toward God, and that at no stage can God coerce us, or hand us over that which would cease to be valuable if it were not won by struggle. It is not our success, but our faithfulness in using such opportunities as we have, which is the criterion of God's judgment of us. Christ

recognizes very fully the great disparity in our opportunities: all we are asked to do is to use such as we have to the full. We are not judged by our success in getting, but by our faith, persevering, unquenchable, in an eventual answer.

It has been suggested by some modern writers that prayer may not have any objective value, since there may perhaps be no God to hear it, but that auto-suggestion is the modern equivalent of prayer, and will certainly take its place in the future, and that this latter has undoubted value. We can keep on making good suggestions to ourselves, and these are sure to do us good, even if there be no such thing as God.

Now we must, I am sure, contend that prayer and auto-suggestion are not the same thing at all. You can, by auto-suggestion, no doubt, make considerable progress in the realization of your own ideals, and if you have ideals, whether mental or physical, which you have not yet been able to attain, it is a very good method of making them effective.

But auto-suggestion will not give you *new* ideals; it may indeed very well confirm you in inferior ones.

When the Jews kept on repeating, "The

temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we," they were using auto-suggestion, and it had on them an exceedingly bad effect. For religion is not the keeping of a moral code: it is the eternal reaching out after communion with an infinitely perfect life, and we cannot attain that by any mechanism which merely impresses upon us our own thoughts, however good they may be. Prayer, if it is true prayer, a real communing with the Eternal, is continually giving us new points of view, new desires, new knowledge. When prayer has done this for us, and we have made these desires our own, then auto-suggestion may very usefully be invoked to make these desires available for use. Auto-suggestion is speaking to myself: prayer is speaking with God. There is a vast difference.¹

In all that has been said hitherto about prayer, I want to make it clear that I am not

¹ Good people of narrow sympathies are apt to be unfeeling and unprogressive, enjoying their egotistical goodness. Their case, on a higher level, is analogous to that of the man completely degraded to a hog. They have reached a state of stable goodness, so far as their own interior life is concerned. This type of moral correctness is, on a large view, so like evil that the distinction is trivial ("Religion in the Making," Whitehead, p. 85).

speaking primarily about that religious exercise which is called "saying prayers."

"Saying our prayers" is one particular technique which can be utilized with much advantage in practising the art of praying; but prayer is a far wider activity than "saying prayers." Prayer, as we have seen, is communing with God: it is envisaging ourselves, our friends, our dominant interests, and the world as a whole, from God's point of view, from the viewpoint of eternity. Thus the statesman prays when he sees politics in view of God's purpose for the State; the musician prays when he refuses the lure of cheap and popular music, and tries to attune his ear to the music of heaven; the mother prays when she tries, not to educate her children according to her own ideals, but as the children of God, realizing them as holding directly from Him. You cannot judge how truly a man prays by knowing how much time he spends in "saying prayers." It is quality in prayer, and not quantity, which counts: we are not heard for our "much speaking"; one might even imagine a person whose life was wholly spent in prayer, that is, in co-operating with the Divine Will, and who yet spent very little time at all in formal devotional exercises, in "saying prayers"; and it is cer-

tainly true that many people spend much time in devotional exercises and never pray at all, since they are, all the time, intent only on securing their own way, by attempts to bribe the Most High.

The practice of prayer then, like the pursuit of science, depends upon a belief that the universe is fundamentally law abiding, that it is not capricious, that it is fundamentally friendly to man, akin to his mind, and amenable to his manipulation.

Both prayer and science also depend upon a belief that the nature of the universe is not to be *easily* understood; that it discloses its secrets only to the diligent seeker; that its superficial appearance belies its true nature, and that only those find its secrets who devote their lives to their discovery. Science discovers, behind apparent disorder and caprice, a purpose beneficent to mankind; prayer discovers the beating of a father's heart.

One further question remains. Can prayer alter the material world? It is often held that prayer may indeed affect character, but cannot move mountains. Now, plainly, prayer does alter the world. Prayer, that is, the study and realization of God's will, has done away with slavery, has peopled North America, has

stopped wars, and thus made deserts fertile, has drained swamps, has conquered epidemics, has prolonged human life. These things are the result of belief that the world is rational and friendly to man and, when understood, can be harnessed to the needs of man, and all these results have come from reasoning and acting on that belief, and passionately knocking at God's door until it opened and disclosed His secret counsel; and this is prayer in its highest sense.

It is true that prayers answered, in the sense of getting what we want by asking God for it, are startlingly few. We hear sometimes of "remarkable" answers to prayer. There are far more remarkable failures to answer prayer—always in that narrower sense of getting what we want. Occasionally we hear of a good man deciding at the last moment not to travel in a train which was subsequently wrecked: but trains which *are* wrecked contain just as good men, and more of them.

If prayer is just a mechanism for getting what we ask for, we must allow that it is a very unreliable method, and more often than not breaks down. But if it is "the practice of the presence of God," the persistent effort to know what God wants us to do, and what He wants the world to be, then we may indeed say

Authority in Religion

that prayer has revolutionized the world, and has taught us that we can set no limits to its victories.

The attempt to tie all people down to a particular technique of the life of prayer has been very disastrous in the past, and is always bound to discourage many people who really do keep trying to discover, and commune with, the Divine Will, but cannot digest the little "exercises" which others feel to be helpful in stimulating their Godward activities. The recitation of "Offices" undoubtedly helps many people to live a prayerful life, to kneel helps some, to walk up and down helps others, to sing hymns, to sit in corporate silence, to manipulate a rosary, to rise up with the sun and spend an hour alone, to pay visits to the Sacrament reserved in church for that purpose. All these are different prescriptions, found by experience very valuable in certain cases by physicians of the spirit of great renown. But it is quite certain that they don't help everybody, and all of them are liable to degenerate into magic and become merely methods of incantation.

Yet we must remember that to have no technique at all for getting into touch and retaining hold of God, is equally likely to end in disaster. The modern Pharisee is apt to be the

man who says, "I thank my God that I say no prayers, I use no Sacraments, I have no set times of devotion, and yet see how I live a life of blameless beneficence compared to these miserable children of the Churches."

It often seems to us strange that it should be so hard a matter to know our Maker and our Father; but, as George Eliot said, "the soul needs something hidden and uncertain for the maintenance of that doubt and hope and effort which are the breath of its life." As the soul passes out of that belief in magic which makes us expect by some formula to produce a God to wait upon our desires, to those austere and bleak heights on which we have often to see the frustration of our desires, as we are illumined by the first vistas of the Divine purpose for our lives, we know that the effort and the loss is worth while for the new assurance which is given that we at last possess that which no vicissitudes of life can take away.

V

RELIGION AND SECULAR LIFE

IT is widely assumed in our own day that the spheres of religion and business lie apart, and should be scrupulously kept apart. We observe this view becoming prominent whenever there is a great social upheaval in the nation. It is assumed by the secular press that the matters at issue, if they are in the sphere of business relationships, are in no way the concern of the Church. It may perhaps be conceded that the Church is quite in order in praying, in a general way, that we may have peace and justice in the community: such a proceeding, people think, if it does no good, can probably do no harm. It may be conceded further that, if the Church could succeed in making the combatants in industrial strife into good Churchmen, such an event might further the cause of peace, but it is commonly held to be nothing short of disastrous that the Church

should deal with economic principles, or enunciate the motives which should underlie the pursuit of trade. Such a proceeding is held to involve taking the Church "outside its proper sphere," "lowering the cause of religion," "stirring up strife among religious men," and so on.

Now this condition raises questions of the very deepest import to religion and also to the State.

Let us remember first what we mean by "the Church." It is often hastily taken to mean the clergy. But the Church does not mean the clergy: it means the society of men and women praying, thinking, and acting in their corporate capacity as disciples of Christ, and filled with His spirit. The Church is therefore a society of people engaged in everyday business, composed of shopkeepers, students, housewives, artisans, and so on, and it is impossible for them to live their ordinary lives without at every moment having to decide, either consciously or unconsciously, for what ends, and according to what ideals, their business should be carried on. The clergy are the ministers or officials of the society, who are mainly responsible to the society (as well as to God) for declaring the general principles of Christ's Law and its ap-

Authority in Religion

plication to particular departments of life. In primitive communities the clergy were mainly concerned with conducting magical ceremonies for warding off the judgments of God, and so shielding the community from pestilences, famines, wars, thunderstorms, and the depredations of insects and wild beasts, by more or less magical incantations. To-day we have learnt that these functions are best left to science: but it remains the duty of the Church to see that science is directed not, as so well may be the case, to the destruction of life, or to the segregation of rich and poor, but to the enrichment of the life of the whole community.

One of the greatest dangers with which our whole society is threatened to-day lies in the ominous fact that science is and has for a whole generation been, occupied in creating and developing immense physical forces, and has made no corresponding advance in thinking out the problem of how these forces are to be used. It is as though a primitive community had suddenly developed a new process of making steel, and had left it purely to chance as to whether the steel should be converted into swords or into pruning hooks. This constant development of power, with no corresponding thought as to how this power is to be used, is a tremendous

Religion and Secular Life

danger to the future of humanity, as well as being a foolish and futile proceeding in itself.

Economic ambitions are good servants, they are bad masters. Harnessed to a social purpose, they will turn the mill and grind the corn. But the question, to what end the wheels revolve, still remains; and on that question the naïve and uncritical worship of economic power, which is the mood of unreason too often engendered in those whom that new Leviathan has hypnotised by its spell, throws no light. Its result is not seldom a world in which men command a mechanism that they cannot fully use and an organization which has every perfection except that of motion (Tawney, "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," p. 282).

In regard to the detail of ordinary business, it is obvious that the clergy are not by their training fitted to direct these operations; but they ought to be, by their training, fitted to say what the moral *objectives* of business and trade ought to be. For it is quite possible, of course, for a man to be an extremely able business expert, and yet to be directing his preëminent ability into channels which the Christian conscience must unhesitatingly declare to be mischievous and misconceived. He is like the man

Authority in Religion

of whom it was said that he had so much taste, and all of it so very bad. A man of preëminent business ability might, to take an extreme instance, be engaged in the slave trade, or in providing opium or alcohol to uncivilized races, or firearms for unjust wars. In such a case it is the duty of the Church to declare that such businesses, however ably conducted, are morally reprehensible. The fact that the conductors of the business may be much abler financiers than the officers of the Church, and have an intimate knowledge of the processes of their business, to which the officials of the Church can lay no claim, would not absolve the Church from stepping in to denounce the objective of the business itself as immoral.

Or again, a perfectly moral business, as, for instance, the trade in corn or coal, may be carried on in an immoral way. It may be carried on not with the object of providing people who need coal and corn with these commodities, after giving a fair reward to those who provide them, but with the primary object of making the people who need coal and corn pay as much for them as they can be induced, by their dire necessities, to pay; in fact, not to provide but to *hold back*, these necessities, the *primary* object of the trade being not the service of the

Religion and Secular Life

community but the enrichment of the vendors at the expense of the needy. In such a case it is the plain duty of the Church to declare that the *motive* of the trade is immoral. It may be an exceedingly ably conducted business, and in itself a very laudable and necessary trade, but it is immoral in regard to the motives which in practice control it.¹ Thus the affairs of business concern Church and State conjointly.

Now there is a long, continuous and honorable tradition of the Church by which the Church has felt bound to declare what are the true objects of the possession of material goods, the true motives for trade, the true human relations within the business of those who command and those who give service.

This witness has been always from the first felt to be one of the primary objects of the existence of the Church, and though often this witness has been weakened, sometimes quite disastrously weakened, by the worldly lives and vicious examples of those who claimed, and rightly claimed, the duty to put forward the true motives of business activities, yet ideally

¹ "Jerusalem stands," said Archbishop Laud, "not for the City and the State only . . . nor for the Temple and the Church only, but jointly for both" (quoted by Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 175).

Authority in Religion

the witness has been a noble part of the work of the Church for mankind.

It would be quite impossible, in the course of so short an essay, to give a history of the principles laid down from time to time by the leaders of Christian thought in this matter.¹

They might be briefly summed up as follows:

(1) Private property exists in order to give to the individual such security and freedom that he may be able to give his full contribution to the community. Any accumulation of private property beyond what is necessary to enable him to give to the community the best service possible is stealing, a robbing of the community.

(2) Lending is to be undertaken not with the primary object of gain to the lender, but for the relief of those who need. Interest on loans is to be moderate, representing no more than the true value of the sum lent, and is not to be harshly claimed from those in need.

(3) There is such a thing as a "fair price"—*justum pretium*. It is the business of the community, if necessity arise, to fix this, especially for staple needs: to demand more than this, on account of the dire necessity of poor and needy

¹ This has been exhaustively set forth in Tawney's "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism."

Religion and Secular Life

persons to give any price demanded, is sinful.

It is not contended here that the Church itself always acted consistently or wisely in carrying out these principles: it is only contended that these principles were felt to be at the very root of Christian corporate life.

It was not until the rise of commerce on a large scale in the seventeenth century, which was more or less coincident with the break up of organized Christianity into warring sects, that the witness of the Church was weakened and tended to disappear out of sight.

In our own day the movement known as "Christian Socialism," though in truth it has no necessary connection with Socialism as generally understood, has to some extent again revived the ancient Christian tradition. Maurice, Kingsley, Tawney, Gore and Holland, have brought back to the religion of our day the belief that the *objects* of trade and the *motives* of trade, as apart from the actual business detail and mechanism, are objects of profound significance to the Christian community.

If this witness is to be revived, it is primarily necessary that (1) the Church should show an example, which it conspicuously fails to show to-day, of the due care for its own employees in its own business, and of the right place of

Authority in Religion

what is called "private means" among its members.

(2) That it should distinguish clearly the general *objects* and *principles* of business, with which religion is intimately concerned as a Church, from those details of business management in which it cannot, with any degree of authority, offer useful advice.

(3) That it should not be precluded by Biblical texts or ancient tradition from dealing with freedom with new problems which were never envisaged in the days in which these traditions grew up.

Let us now pass to consider a few notable instances of the Church's influence over public opinion in dealing with certain typical cases of conscience.

John Attwood was in 1364 accused that, "whereas one Robert de Cawode had two quarters of wheat for sale in common market on the Pavement within Newgate, he, the said John, cunningly and by secret words whispering in his ear, fraudulently withdrew Cawode out of the common market; and then they went together into the Church of the Friars Minor, and there John bought the two quarters at 15½d. per bushel, being 2½d. over the common selling price at that time in the market;

Religion and Secular Life

to the great loss and deceit of the common people, and to the increase of the dearness of corn."

Attwood denied the offense, and "put himself on the country." Thereupon a jury was impaneled, who gave as verdict that Attwood had not only thus bought the corn, but had afterward returned to the market and boasted of his misdoing; "this he said and did to increase the dearness of corn." Accordingly he was sentenced (by the magistrates) to be put into the pillory for three hours, and one of the sheriffs was directed to see the sentence executed and proclamation made of the cause of the punishment (Ashley, "Economic Theory and History," vol. i, p. 184).

Here is a case of a man who deliberately ran up the price of corn, in order to sell his own corn at a higher price than that ruling at the moment: such a man would now be thought a clever fellow. If he did this on a sufficiently large scale, he might even be ennobled, and attain high office in the State; but in times when it was still considered a sin as well as a crime to raise the price of food for the sake of private gain, the man Attwood found himself in the pillory.

A similar fate overtook the man who went

out to meet the ships coming into port, and proceeded to buy the merchandise from them in gross, and sell it at a greater and dearer price than the first merchants would do, to the grievance of the common people. This was again an attempt, which in our day would be regarded as laudable, to make a little money by getting somewhat ahead of other people and so compelling the public to pay an unnecessarily high price.

Similarly, in 1347, a man who caused two bushels of corn belonging to him to be brought to market and then, "to the increase of the dearth of corn, offered for a bushel of his own wheat 1½d. beyond the common selling price of the bushel of wheat in that market on the same day sold," was punished by the magistrates. In all these cases the man is punished for raising unnecessarily the price of food to the detriment of the common people and for his own private advantage. The punishment proceeds from the community: the principles which led to the punishment were supplied by the Church.

The political economy of the nineteenth century would have regarded these actions as not only innocent but even laudable, and would have regarded these medieval laws as barbarous and

Religion and Secular Life

detrimental to the public weal. We are perhaps in these days coming back in part to the medieval idea, which was founded on the Christian theory that it is right that the Government should restrain private greed when it aims, for the sake of private advantage, to raise the price of necessities beyond what is necessary to give a fair living to those who bring those necessities to the doors of those who need them. The modern Food Council is in line with the traditional views of the Church.

It is a proposition which to most ordinary people to-day would seem most obvious and necessary that every one has a right to do what he wills with his own, provided always that he does not injure others. But this is a doctrine which by no means seemed self-evident to the fathers of the Church. So St. Ambrose says:

“What injustice is there in my diligently preserving my own, so long as I do not invade the property of another?” Shameless saying! . . . That which is taken by thee, beyond what would suffice for thee, is taken by violence. Is it that God is unjust, in not distributing to us the means of life equally, so that thou shouldst have abundance while others are in want? . . . Thou, then, who hast received the gift of God, thinkest thou

Authority in Religion

that thou committest no injustice by keeping to thyself alone what would be the means of life to many? . . . It is the bread of the hungry thou keepest, it is clothing of the naked thou lockest up; the money thou buriest is the redemption of the wretched!

Some great teachers went even so far as to teach that trade and business were in themselves wrong: so Tertullian—"If covetousness be removed, there is no reason for gain, and, if there is no reason for gain, there is no need for trade."

St. Jerome held that the trader's gain must be another's loss, and business was in any case dangerous to the soul. St. Augustine held that business was in itself an evil, for it turns men from seeking true rest, which is God. St. Leo, with the courage and common sense characteristic of Rome at her best, taught that it was the *spirit* in which the business was carried on which made it either lawful or unlawful, and that trade was not in itself an evil.

There is another great department of life in which the Church and State are deeply concerned, in the nature of the contract made and the motives underlying it—the relationship of marriage. Marriage may be briefly described as the association of man and woman for

Religion and Secular Life

mutual comfort and support and the nurture and protection of offspring. This association may be, and has been, of varying degrees of social value. It may range from being of an extremely temporary and non-ethical character, breaking up for all kinds of trivial reasons, or it may be of a highly ethical and permanent character. It has been up to now generally held, and, in spite of present appearances, will probably be always held, to be of the deepest importance to the community that this relationship should be both happy and permanent. Especially for the sake of children, a happy home and a permanent home is of the greatest possible value to the State, and neither Church nor State can be uninterested in its maintenance.

To these obvious considerations, which commend themselves to all citizens generally, as objects which make it advisable for the community to step in to regulate what might otherwise be thought to be purely a matter of private concern, the Church would add the further concern that Christ Himself definitely recommended and blessed permanent monogamy. This association, He says, is part of the purpose of God, in the nature of creation; and not only the association, but the permanency

of the association, is part of the Divine ideal. The divorce of people once married, He says, is a great evil, an adultery. Some people (at all events), He says, are "joined together by God," and no society has a right to put such people asunder. Church and State, therefore, are at one in attaching the highest value to permanence in the marriage relationship and in deprecating the breaking up of it.

But a problem arises at once: "What is to be done when the association is *de facto* broken up?" Who are the people who are "joined together by God"? Do they include all who, from whatever motive, have been declared man and wife by State or Church? If, for instance, people have married purely for rank, or money, or out of spite, or in ignorance, are they "joined together by God"? And if not, what is it right for them to do?

Quite early in the history of the Church such problems arose. By the time the Gospel of St. Matthew was written, an exception had been made (to the rigid standard which forbade all divorce) where one party had broken the contract by adultery. In such a case the other party was set free to marry again. This exception was referred (whether rightly or wrongly we have no means of knowing) to the

Religion and Secular Life

actual teaching of Christ. St. Paul adds another exception where one party was an unbeliever. In such a case the believing party was not bound to retain the unbelieving partner. "He is in no bondage in such cases" (1 Cor. vii).

Pope Callistus even allowed a relationship of wealthy women with slave men outside of marriage (Harnack, "Mission and Expansion of Christianity," vol. i, p. 171, etc.).

In the Eastern Church divorce was allowed for failure to maintain a wife, prolonged absence, lunacy, and other causes which were held to be equivalent to death, such as impotency and incurable leprosy or insanity.¹

In the Western Church the actual words of Christ were held to forbid divorce on any ground whatever. But in practice dissolution of marriage was not at all difficult. If it could be shown that husband and wife were even distantly related (as they generally were in a small community where there was little movement of population), if they had had the same godparents, if they had made already some other like sexual association, even of an immoral kind, if they could be shown to have been ignorant of

¹ See article by Dr. Mingana in "The Interpreter," 1921.

Authority in Religion

the importance of their act, or coerced by parents; on all these grounds marriage could be declared null and void from the beginning, and both parties were free to marry again. Thus the medieval Latin Church was *in fact* very ready, in the case of those able to pay the fees involved, to dissolve marriage, while continuing literally to forbid divorce, and so preserving the letter of Christ's sayings.

The Anglican Reformers had prepared a code of marriage during the reign of Edward VI, which allowed divorce for adultery together with the right of remarriage, but this code never became law.

The present practice of the Anglican and the other reformed Churches in England varies very greatly. Anglican bishops lately have given a special license for a woman who had divorced her husband to marry again in church. But the usual custom is to forbid marriage in church to any who have been divorced, but to admit the "innocent" party, whether remarried by the State or not, to Communion, if he or she so desires. The modern Roman Church still allows dissolution of marriage much more readily than the Churches of the Reformation, on the ground of nullity, due to various grounds, while forbidding divorce. The Greek Church allows di-

voice for various reasons. Since 1857 divorce for adultery has been allowed in England by the State. The Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops in 1908 did not forbid divorce to the innocent party where adultery is proved, and did not refuse Communion to such a person if remarried.

In 1908 the Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops from all parts of the world passed a resolution: "Where an innocent person has, by means of a court of law, divorced a spouse for adultery, and desires to enter into another contract of marriage, it is undesirable that such a contract should receive the blessing of the Church." (This prohibition of ecclesiastical remarriage in church was only carried by 87 votes to 84.) On the other hand, the same Conference recommended that the clergy should not be instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil marriage, are thus (i. e., the remarriage of an innocent party in a divorce for adultery) married. In 1920, the same Conference admitted the right of national Churches of dealing with the cases of those who desired to be remarried after divorcing an adulterous spouse.

In the Episcopal Church in the United States, bishops recommend persons wanting to

Authority in Religion

be remarried after divorce to go to the ministers of some other denomination for their marriage, after which they may be admitted to Communion.

It seems clear that it is necessary for the Church (1) to do its utmost to warn men and women of the peril of marrying for inadequate reasons, (2) to do its utmost to prevent the dissolution of marriages once made, and (3) to make such provision that, where marriage has failed and the union is, in fact, at an end, the lives of such people should not be made intolerable, and that if some other union should be seriously formed and maintained, such cases should be treated on their merits, and the parties forming them should not be ignored by the Church, or treated as though they were outside the fold of Christ's people. The Roman Church in practice has means, as we know, of getting round the obstacle of divorce by finding that the original marriage was void. This is often a very unconvincing and undignified method of procedure, and it would seem more honest to allow that some marriages, honestly and deliberately undertaken by good people, have in fact become impossible, not always owing to the adultery of one or both parties, and that such a situation has to be frankly

Religion and Secular Life

envisaged, and honorable and charitable provision made for it by Church and State alike.

The provision of different standards by Church and State may be inevitable, but it is always a serious evil. The present attitude of the Church condemns many unfortunate people to lifelong misery, encourages vicious and clandestine relationships, and seriously weakens the Christian influence of the Church.

It seems to us an astonishing fact that the Christian Church, during the greater part of its history, has been lukewarm and almost indifferent to the existence of slavery. The monks, early in their career, ceased to work themselves and became landlords, owning in many cases large numbers of serfs. The freeing of serfs and slaves does not seem to have been encouraged in medieval times, and the Church showed but little interest in bringing the institution to an end, though in many ways the regulation of the Church tended to lighten the bondage of slavery.¹ Ecclesiastical persons

¹ The disappearance of serfdom—and, after all, it did not disappear from France until late in the eighteenth century, and from Germany till the nineteenth—was part of a general economic movement with which the Church had little to do, and which Churchmen, as property owners, had sometimes resisted. It owed less to Christianity than to the humanitarian liberalism of the French Revolution (Tawny, *op. cit.*).

owned slaves; one Pope decreed that all Englishmen who supported Henry VIII against the foreign power which the Pope put in motion against him, should be sold into slavery; another Pope gave to the kings of Portugal as slaves all the populations of the New World. The Popes made a large revenue from the prostitutes, many thousands in number, in the city of Rome. It was not, as we know, until the eighteenth century that Christian influence brought the slave trade to an end.

The idea of the divisions of classes, each having an appropriate standard of living, has always been accepted by the Christian Church as a whole, and the idea latent in Christ's teaching, of equality of opportunity among all men, has even now not been generally accepted. The value of Christianity as a leaven in society has always been largely discounted by the great growth of vested ecclesiastical interests. The clergy and bishops and governing bodies of the various Churches have been, either directly or indirectly, concerned financially in upholding the framework of commerce, and have therefore found it difficult to denounce abuses out of which their own living has been partly provided. And it is interesting to observe that monastic and other ecclesiastical establishments have

Religion and Secular Life

been just as prone to commercially shady transactions as other business corporations.

Nowhere is this problem of the relation of religion to social life more acute than in those parts of the world to-day where the black race has to live in close proximity with more "advanced" races.

In Kenya, in South Africa, in the South of the United States, the power of Christendom to put Christian principles into actual practice, in view of vast financial interests opposed to equality of treatment for the "upper" and "lower" civilizations, is going in the immediate future to be sternly tested. Future generations will judge us as severely as we are inclined to judge our medieval religious ancestors, if we show ourselves tolerant of treatment for other races which is inconsistent with the principles we profess to hold. For the worth of new religious movements will be judged, and rightly judged, not by the language of new prayer books, or the eloquence of preachers, or the numbers attending our churches, but by the effect of our religion upon our social practice, by the state of our factories, by our treatment of weaker races, by our treatment of those who have fallen wounded in the battle of life, by our power to enforce human stand-

Authority in Religion

ards of marriage, by our power to control the unbridled insolence of excessive wealth. These seem to us to be the tests, as we look back upon past history, of the value of religion, and so it is with us to-day. The true test of "knowing Christ" is, as He said to us, to have fed the hungry, to have clothed the naked, to have visited the prisoners, and this we have to translate into the language of our own day, and that means so to organize corporate life that all work shall be done primarily as service to the community, and paid for by every one who works being given a reward sufficient to provide for him the decencies of life, by the humanizing of all contracts between human beings.

Mr. Bernard Shaw has said that every child should be taught the fundamental economic truth that whoever consumes goods or services without producing by personal effort the equivalent of what he or she consumes, inflicts on the community precisely the same injury that a thief produces, and would, in any honest State, be treated as a thief, however full his or her pockets might be of money made by other people.

This is exactly what the early Christian Fathers were constantly teaching: it is the practical application of Christianity in or-

Religion and Secular Life

dinary life, and if Christianity cannot be successfully applied to the ordinary common life of men, as it is lived to-day, then it is a religion without a future, a tree which needs to be cut down and burnt.

The real test of Christianity is going to be, in our day, the practical application of its principles to the wars, the marriages, the business contracts, and the international contacts of the nations and rival classes of our modern world. It is the acid test of a true religion: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

VI

IMMORTALITY AND PSYCHICAL RESEARCH

IT is not necessary to believe in immortality in order to have a religion or to believe in God. It is quite conceivable that a person should, like the Jews in the earlier part of their history, believe in God, and be not concerned with personal immortality at all.

There are some people who profess not to desire to survive death. Their one desire is to have done with living. To live again is to them the one horror at all costs to be avoided.

Others there are who passionately desire to survive, but who, on that very account, are nervously anxious to discount all arguments in favor of survival, lest their wish should be father to their thought. The mere fact that they so yearn for proof of survival makes them skeptical in regard to every proof which is presented to them.

Some again are assured of survival because

they accept the historical nature of the accounts of Christ's resurrection and, believing these, they are content to believe on that authority in their own survival. But many, probably an increasing number of people, do not feel that the evidence for Christ's physical resurrection is sufficiently cogent to bring absolute assurance of survival, unless we are independently prepared to postulate the probability of survival by other considerations. We may, I think, take it that St. Paul represents the views of most modern thinkers in rather deducing Christ's resurrection from a general antecedent belief that "the dead are raised," rather than deducing a general belief in survival from the fact of the resurrection of Christ's body on the "third day."

The desire for immortality, merely for its own sake, has no ethical value whatever. To desire, for instance, to have a prolongation for all eternity of eating and drinking would not be religious, but would be purely non-moral. It seems doubtfully moral to desire "eternal rest"—to wish for a heaven in which "we do nothing for ever and ever."

It is doubtfully moral to desire immortality as a *reward* of virtue; for blessedness, as Spinoza taught us, is not the reward of virtue,

Authority in Religion

but virtue itself, *Beatitudo non est virtutis præmium, sed ipsa virtus*. The only religious ground for desiring immortality is the desire to partake in the life of God, who is Eternal.

Not to escape punishment, not to avoid annihilation, not to be able to pursue sensuous pleasures, not to avoid working and suffering, should we desire eternal life, but just because we desire the fullest communion in the life of the Eternal God.

To live the Divine life is the only pledge of eternal life. "He that keepeth My saying shall never taste of death," "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren."

If we are living in tune with the purpose which formed and which sustains life, then we are now sharing in that eternity over which physical death can have no power. Death is an apparently necessary stage in the evolution of life. So Browning writes:

Death! death! It is this continual harping upon death that I despise so much. You know as well as I do that Death is Life, just as our daily, momentarily decaying body is none the less alive, and ever recruiting new forces of existence.

Without death, which is our crêpe-like churchyardy word for change, for growth, there could be

Immortality and Psychical Research

no prolongation of that which we call Life. Pshaw! it is foolish to argue upon such a thing even. For myself, I deny death as an end to everything. Never say of me that I am dead.

Tennyson, as well as Browning, felt profoundly the need of the soul to be sure of survival of bodily death, and he had also the certainty that this hope was justified.

What matters [he says] anything in this world without full faith in the Immortality of the Soul and of Love?

There is a something that watches over us: and our individuality endures: that's my faith, and that's all my faith.

What then are the considerations which would persuade us that the survival of bodily death is likely or certain to be true?

First and foremost I should place the fact that it would appear, from God's general plan of the world, that individuality is part of that plan. The higher and more complex the structure of life becomes, the more important becomes the differentiation of individuals. We feel that this individualizing of life is part of the plan of progress. If you lose a canary, you can easily replace it by another canary which is not easily distinguishable from its predecessor.

Authority in Religion

If your daffodils die, you get another bunch which is exactly similar, for all general purposes, to the former one.

If your horse or dog dies, you cannot so easily get one with exactly the same individual character. These animals have already some individual character of their own.

Among some savage human beings there is great readiness to get rid of children: they are not greatly missed or lamented. They are merely children. They are felt to be easily replaceable. But the higher the scale of human life the more we feel that it is the *individual* that counts, and the more we feel that the individual has a duty to make himself as perfect, *as an individual*, as possible. We feel that it is his duty to do this right on into old age. It is not enough for him to be a typical undifferentiated man, but he ought, we feel, to be *that* particular man, different from all other men. Life progresses in proportion as each man tries to be himself, and not merely a typical, undifferentiated human being.

This makes us suppose that individuation is part of the purpose of the universe, and it seems therefore difficult to believe that this purpose, so hardly achieved, should be by death doomed to frustration.

Immortality and Psychical Research

There must be, no doubt, some parts of the individual, as we know him, which death *has* power to destroy. "Meats for the belly," says St. Paul, "and the belly for meats, but God shall destroy both it and them." There are parts of the individual's manifestation which are probably only of use in such a material world as ours is, and these no doubt would perish when the individual ceases to manifest himself in this material world. And we cannot be sure what these parts are.

We are taught to express our belief in the resurrection of the body. When we speak of the Resurrection of the Body, what do we mean by the "body" in this phrase?

We clearly do not mean, even in our ordinary speech, something which depends for its identity upon the identity of the material particles of which it is composed.

We are aware that the component parts of the "body" are in a continual state of flux; they are continually being broken down, and continually being renewed.

We are assured that the whole bodily frame changes often and entirely, as regards its material structure, during our mundane life, and yet we clearly believe in the identity of the "body" which holds together this unity of ever-

changing particles. The body remains the same (we are quite sure of that), though every particle may have vanished which originally composed it, and its whole structure been renewed from alien sources. The body is the thing which walks, or speaks, or absorbs food, and remains the same, though leg or mouth or stomach be composed of totally different material to-day from that which composed them ten years ago.

This view, that identity of substance does not depend upon identity of the material composing it, is not, let it be remarked, a modern view hastily adopted by the Church to prop up a loosely worded or antiquated dogma in view of modern science. It is worth while quoting at length the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas, as showing that medieval philosophers were sometimes at least as "modern" as other people:

That which does not bar numerical unity in a man while he lives on uninterruptedly, clearly can be no bar to the identity of the risen man with the man that was. In a man's body, while he lives, there are not always the same parts in respect of matter, but only in respect of species. In respect of matter there is a flux and reflux of parts. Still that fact does not bar the man's numerical unity from the beginning to the end of his life. The form and species of the several parts continues

Immortality and Psychical Research

throughout life, but the matter of the parts is dissolved by the natural heat, and new matter accrues through nourishment. Yet the man is not numerically different by the difference of his component parts at different ages, although it is true that the material composition of the man at one stage of his life is not his material composition at another. Addition is made from without to the stature of a boy without prejudice to his identity, for the boy and the adult are numerically the same man.

This we can partly realize when we think of a river or a crowd. We gaze at the Thames from Westminster Bridge after we have been away from England for many years, and we say, "There is the river that we love, absolutely unaltered."

Never did sun more beautifully steep
In his splendour, valley, rock, or hill;
Ne'er saw I, never felt, a calm so deep:
The river glideth at his own sweet will.

Yet in that river there is no particle the same as those we saw when we were last there. Nor should we admire a bucketful of water taken out of the river. It is the embodiment of a great spiritual idea that we really love, even though the body of the idea is different in all

Authority in Religion

its particles from that which it was before and will be again to-morrow.

So we go to a sale at some great store, and we say, "Just the same crowd that there was yesterday," not meaning that the persons who compose the crowd are necessarily the same, but that the same identical impression of crowd was once more made upon our brain.

So it is well to be cautious as to our answer if we are asked whether the "matter" of which our bodies are composed "rises again." We should be inclined at once to say confidently that it did not, and that there was no necessity that it should. But we cannot wisely answer the question until some expert will tell us what matter is, and experts are less confident in their definitions than they were twenty years ago. Professor Ward, of Cambridge, a dealing with this hesitancy of scientific authority to define what matter is, sums up the position as follows:

Heat is a mode of motion, elasticity is a mode of motion, light and magnetism are modes of motion. Nay, mass itself is, in the end, supposed to be but a mode of motion of a something which is neither solid, nor liquid, nor gas, that is neither itself a body nor an aggregate of bodies, that it is not phenomenal and must not be noumenal, a veritable *apeiron* on which we can impose our

own terms. I am sure this process will remind many of you of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. I trust I may be pardoned for the allusion. The Cheshire cat, you remember, on a certain occasion vanished quite slowly, beginning with the end of the tail and ending with a grin, which remained some time after the rest of it had gone. "Well, I've often seen a cat without a grin," thought Alice: "but a grin without a cat: It's the most curious thing I ever saw in my life."

This humorous illustration puts before us very vividly the difficulty of defining exactly what part that thing which is visible and tangible in us may have in the new life, at all events in our present stage of scientific knowledge. So when we are asked whether the matter out of which the body is composed rises again, we must answer that we still wait to hear from the scientist what he means by matter; at present he and we alike are obliged to confess our ignorance: if he can tell us what exactly is meant by matter we can tell him whether we believe it will rise again. We are merely concerned to point out that the particular atoms which are eaten by worms, or destroyed by fire, or dissolved in the sea, are not, so far as we can see, in any way essential to bodily identity, and therefore we do not need to consider their

Authority in Religion

future as a religious problem; they are no essential parts of the body.

But we may, I think, feel that there is a strong presumption that a process so carefully prepared by nature, and so earnestly fostered by what we believe to be our higher instincts, is not intended to be in vain; individuality persists.

We may believe this, without necessarily believing that *every* individual survives. It may be that survival is an achievement of the few and not a necessity for the mass. We may believe, with Bishop Gore, that men are not naturally immortal, but may win it by their cultivation of the eternal values. Christ seems to argue that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob survive because they participated in the life of God, and the life of God is eternal and not transitory. Therefore all who participate in the life of God become participators in a life which is eternal. And this is, I think, a strong argument in favor of the eternity of individual life, where that life is lived in communion with God. We cannot suppose that God dies, and those, therefore, in whom the life of God is implanted must survive by virtue of the eternal life in which they share. "They all live unto Him."

This might, however, only be an argument

Immortality and Psychical Research

in favor of a racial immortality, an immortality in which individuality was swallowed up as a drop of rain survives in the sea.

But if we only believe this—that we survive in the survival of the race—then, again, we must suppose that this individualizing process has been a failure, or was never intended at all. It would seem also, in this case, as though the life of God was just a placid sea of life, not a workshop, or a society of living intelligences. Whether it is a matter to us of rejoicing or of sorrow, it seems far more probable that this complicated form of self-consciousness, which has so hardly and with such infinite difficulty been produced, survives and becomes always *more*, and not less, individual with the passage of time.

Is there any proof of this survival? If it happens, we should certainly expect that some proof of its having occurred would be available. Some messages from spirits surviving in another world would, one would suppose, have penetrated through to our material world.

What is the evidence for such survival in the modern science of Psychical Research?

The problems with which Psychical Research has to deal are not new. They are as old as the history of man. In every generation events have

been reported, with more or less good evidence to support them, which are incomprehensible by the ordinary laws of physical science, as they are now generally understood. Many of these events alleged to have taken place we now see to be obviously subjective hallucinations, due to the prevalent credulity of the circle in which they were supposed to have occurred. Others we can now neither accept nor reject, because the evidence is manifestly unsatisfactory and incomplete, and this is true, we now feel, of many events described by the obviously honest and sincere recorders of the Bible. Others, however, appear to rest on evidence which would be completely satisfactory and cogent were it not that the events alleged have been, up to now, so completely inexplicable that we feel bound to reject the evidence rather than believe things which upset the foundations upon which our ordinary normal experience has hitherto been built up.

These unusual, or supranormal, happenings would include the conveying of messages over vast space without any apparent physical means of communication; the reading of thoughts which had not been in any way expressed; automatic writing of messages, sometimes in languages unknown to the normal

mind of the writer; the vision of events taking place, and the hearing of things said or thought in places far removed from the percipient; the knowledge, through dreams or visions, of the death, and all the circumstances of death, of persons known or unknown, at great distances, and before normal knowledge of the event could be ascertained; the perception of events in the life of a person through holding some article habitually carried by him; the premonition of events which have afterward come true even in small details, the reception of messages from people no longer alive in the body, and sometimes unknown to the recipient of the message, which have proved to be characteristic of the person who was alleged to have sent them. All these things are alleged to have happened, both in our own day and in every previous age, and in our own day a certain proportion of such events has stood the test of very searching and even bitter criticism.

In former ages it was the custom to ascribe all supranormal happenings either (1) to fraud, or (2) to delusion, or (3) to supranormal agency, either good or bad. The tendency of the professors of natural science has been to believe that they were due either to fraud or delusion, the tendency of the ecclesiastical

Authority in Religion

mind has been to attribute them to either celestial or diabolic agency, with the further tendency to attribute to celestial agency those that ministered to the exaltation of Churches and priesthods, and to the devil those that tended to subvert such authority. The tendency of the Reformation, and especially of Lutheranism, was to increase very largely the belief in the all-pervading power of devils and evil spirits. Furthermore, all society was agreed that people possessing supranormal, or, as we should now say, psychic powers, ought to be burnt or otherwise summarily disposed of. Such conditions did not tend to promote psychical research, or to encourage unprejudiced criticism.

The attitude of the scientific mind has been even more traditional and conservative than the ecclesiastical mind. Immanuel Kant once wrote on this subject:

Philosophy, which never fears to compromise itself by examining all kinds of foolish questions, is often much embarrassed when she encounters on her march certain facts she dares not *doubt*, yet will not believe for fear of ridicule. This is the case with ghost stories. In short, there is no reproach to which philosophy is more sensible than that of credulity, or the suspicion of any connection

Immortality and Psychical Research

with vulgar superstitions. Those who cheaply assume the name of *savants*, and insist on receiving the privileges due to learned men, mock at whatever (being as inexplicable to the *savant* as it is to the ignorant) places both on the same level. That is why ghost stories are always listened to and well received in private, but pitilessly disavowed in public. We may take it for granted that no academy of science will ever choose such a subject for discussion, not because every one of its members is fully persuaded of the silliness and falseness of all these narratives, but because the law of prudence has wisely put a limit to the examination of such questions. Ghost stories will always have those who believe them in *secret*, and will be always received in public with an incredulity of good form.

For my part, ignorant as I am of the way in which the human spirit enters the world and of the ways in which it makes its exit, I dare not deny the truth of such stories as are in circulation. By a reserve, however, which to some may seem singular, I permit myself to hold in doubt each in particular, and yet to believe in them when all taken together.

Kant was much more open-minded than most scientists. A more characteristic attitude of science toward novel fields of research is that of a member of the French Academy of Sciences

Authority in Religion

who, on being shown Edison's phonograph in 1878, seized the demonstrator by the collar and exclaimed, "Wretch! We are not to be made dupes of by a ventriloquist," and afterward declared that "it was impossible to admit that mere vile metal could perform the work of human phonation," and the attitude of many learned people both in the ecclesiastical and scientific world to-day reminds us of the report of the Royal College of Doctors of Bavaria, who, after being consulted as to whether railroads should be allowed, reported that they would cause the greatest deterioration in the health of the public, because such rapid movement would cause brain trouble among travelers and giddiness among those who looked at moving trains. For this reason they recommended that all railway tracks should be enclosed by high wooden fences, raised above the height of the cars. The experience of the past should make us remember in dealing with psychic phenomena that incredulity is a bias to be discounted as well as credulity.

So long as men had to choose between attributing these alleged occurrences either to fraud, delusion, or possession by angels or devils, it was not unnatural perhaps that little progress in their investigation should be made.

Immortality and Psychical Research

But these are not now the alternatives before us.

The study of telepathy, hypnosis, and of the workings of the subconscious levels of the human mind, has opened out to us explanations of many of the experiences which baffled investigators of former generations.

We know now that, under hypnosis, some individuals are able to see without the use of ordinary sight, to describe events happening at a distance, to recall memories even of infancy, which in normal times are completely unknown to them, to recall even quite casually-acquired knowledge (as, for instance, of advertisements momentarily glanced at in a paper days before); some can profess to be able to see and describe the state of the internal organs of the body (and such people are now being employed for medical diagnosis), and without hypnosis some people can transmit and receive thought without any apparent physical medium. Moreover, we know that, under hypnoidal conditions, people will give utterance to opinions and desires which in normal states they have resolutely repressed, so that the pious will tend to swear, and the irreligious to pray and sing psalms. In dreams and in automatic writings the thoughts of many hearts are dis-

closed, and latent powers, always overruled and inhibited in ordinary consciousness, may blossom out into at least some appearance of reality. If, therefore, we find some person under hypnosis in London describing scenes happening in America, or recalling events which happened in his infancy, or writing with accuracy passages in foreign languages taken from books which he does not remember to have seen, or writing devotional treatises containing opinions which he would normally disavow, we are now at least compelled to examine whether this may not be either clair-audience or clairvoyance, or the resuscitation of a submerged knowledge, or the formulation of a suppressed wish, or the abnormal perception of events which, having happened in the past in a particular spot, have left a trace of their happening on the material surroundings of the place in which they have occurred. That such things should be possible is sufficiently astounding to most of us, but the evidence for such powers is now so overwhelming that few, who have really investigated the subject, would venture to deny their reality. There can be no doubt that at all events many of the messages, and much of the supranormally acquired knowledge formerly ascribed

to spirits or devils, is acquired telepathically. There can be no doubt, I think, that very much of these messages, which is believed in all sincerity to come from external sources, does in reality represent a layer of the percipient's personality, of which he or she is not normally conscious, and would hesitate in normal circumstances to bring into manifestation; and I think there is evidence to show that such persons tend to hypostatize such a stratum of their personality in order to avoid responsibility for it, and to call it by some name of a spirit or hero or saint, and unconsciously build it up into the likeness of a real being, so that their unconscious minds may the more readily accept the subject-matter. These dissociations of personality are well known, and do account, I think, for many of the otherwise insoluble difficulties of trance utterance and automatic writing. The fact that vast numbers of people to-day have been brought up in forms of religion which they, in the depths of their being, reject as immoral and untrue, and yet have not got the learning or the courage to disown, accounts, I believe, for many psychic people giving vent under hypnosis, or in trance, to expressions of religious belief which, however bizarre or trite they may seem

Authority in Religion

to the theologian, are many degrees higher and nobler than the religion of the ordinary man in the street, and vastly superior to their normal utterances. The wide vogue of such utterances as those of Mr. Vale Owen is due, I am sure, to the craving of the ordinary man to have some external authorization for a wider hope of the hereafter than the religion of the Sunday School or the revival meeting has given him. I do not question the sincerity of a man like Mr. Vale Owen, but I suspect that his utterances represent his subconscious recollection of the ordinary theology of spiritistic and "mystical" circles, and his own revolt against a narrower creed, to which perhaps he would have hesitated to give utterance, if he had not honestly believed that it came from a supernatural source. A person who might hesitate to make public on his own authority opinions which are usual in his own circle may feel a sacred obligation to do so if he can believe that they come, without his own volition, from a supernatural source, under the authority (say) of St. Paul, or Plato, or John the Baptist, of "Rector" or "Imperator."

I believe then that a very large proportion of the supranormal messages and scripts and visions can be satisfactorily accounted for by

telepathy and unconscious hypnosis. But I must own that, to my mind, there remains a small residuum which cannot be so accounted for, unless we are to assume that all minds have potential access to all knowledge, present, past and future, and that appears to me, at our present level of knowledge, to be a far greater assumption than we have any right to make, and far harder to accept as probable than any spiritistic hypothesis. When, for instance, I find a person receiving a very circumstantial message from some one she has never known, addressed to persons she has also never heard of, giving clear directions which turn out to be accurate, and giving names and addresses of people to whom the percipient can refer, the person alleging himself to be the communicator having already passed out of the body; if, as I believe, such an event is well attested, it appears to me that either we must assume that the lady who receives the message by automatic writing has access to the thoughts and lives of persons she has never met, or that she has received a message from the other side; and though I am clear that we have still much to learn, and are still at the outset of our explorations, the latter explanation seems to me the easier, and the more prob-

Authority in Religion

able, of the two to adopt at our present stage of knowledge. A good instance of such a communication is given by the novelist, Henry James (in his *Letters*, vol. ii):

I have had from or through a medium in America, near Boston, a message purporting to come from my mother, who died 25 years ago and from whom it ostensibly proceeded during a séance at which my sister-in-law, with two or three other persons, was present. The point is that the message is an allusion to a matter known (so personal is it to myself) to no other individual in the world but me—not possible either to the medium or to my sister-in-law, and an allusion so pertinent and initiated and tender and helpful, and yet so unhelped by any actual earthly knowledge on any one's part, that it quite astounds as well as deeply touches me. If the subject of the message had been conceivably in my sister-in-law's mind it would have been an interesting, but not infrequent, case of telepathy, but, as I say, it couldn't thinkably have been; and she only transmits it to me, after the fact, not even fully understanding it. So, I repeat, I am astounded. (March 1906.)

I do not see why Christians, as Christians, ought to have any *a priori* reluctance to accept such a provisional hypothesis. We believe that, at least in one instance, One who passed

through death was able to make His presence felt and known to those on this side for a short time after His death, and we believe that His life is meant to be typical of our own, or (as Pascal put it) "It is one of the great principles of Christianity, that all which has happened to Jesus Christ must happen in the soul of every Christian." It is at all events not incongruous with our faith to believe that the souls of men may retain the power, under certain conditions, for a short time, to communicate with us even in our present material state, before they pass into that more blessed and desirable state in which appearance to us physically gives place to the far greater nearness of spiritual participation in the eternal life. This would only be to say that Our Lord's post-resurrection experience may be, in some points, typical of our own. Whether there is *evidence* for the truth of such an hypothesis is of course a separate question. I am only arguing that, if it be true to fact, Christians have no concern to deplore it, or reject it as incongruous with our presuppositions. We may also note that many of the arguments commonly used to refute the possibility of all communications with the world of spirits are absolutely fatal to belief in the objective

Authority in Religion

character of Our Lord's resurrection, which necessarily, by its distance in time, is less well attested than many of the alleged communications in our own day.

A congregation would be not a little shocked if the arguments which many well-known preachers employ to discredit present-day psychical phenomena were applied to the accounts in the gospels of the supranormal happenings in the life of Jesus. Father Thurstan well says about this incredulity:

The systematic pulling to pieces and discrediting of human testimony regarding plain issues of fact which this process involves, seems to me subversive in principle of all belief in the historical record of the gospels, and, indirectly, of all belief in Christian revelation ("Dublin Review," July 1920).

We should not, of course, be deterred from the pursuit of truth by the possibility of such a great revolution in our traditional faith, but it is at least curious to see so many Christians using arguments so freely which have that necessary corollary.

Do we realize what an enormous revolution in thought belief in telepathy involves?

The fact surely is that belief in telepathy

from the living without apparent material media is so enormous a step to take for the man brought up in the ordinary materialistic beliefs of to-day (or shall we say of yesterday?) that we do not always realize how far this belief carries us in removing many of the difficulties which face us in belief in the possibility of telepathy with *discarnate* spirits. Lord Rayleigh said that, given irrefragable evidence for telepathy between living persons, he would have no difficulty in extending it to telepathy from the dead. This, I think, is true. If we believe in telepathy between living persons, the destruction of the material body ceases to seem to us the great obstacle to further communion which once it did seem.

I have said that it appears to me to be true that there is some (very small, I think) residuum of supranormal facts, including, I think, the remarkable cross-correspondences, such as that known as the incident of "the Ear of Dionysius," which remain most easily accounted for by belief in real communication from the other side.

Having said that, I should not be sincere if I did not add that the great bulk of such messages as I have seen, which purport to come

from the other world, seems to me to be either incredibly foolish or purely trite and conventional. The descriptions of the other life tend to reproduce suspiciously the ideas of the circle in which they are produced. The Roman Catholic sees Our Lady, the orthodox Christian sees Our Lord and St. Paul, the skeptic converses with Shakspeare or Bacon or Plato. Their descriptions of the other world tend to reproduce their own desires and traditions. Even the utterances purporting to come from Our Lord and His mother are such as not to commend them to our understanding or devotional sense. We feel that if we were forced to judge these characters by such utterances our faith would be very sorely tried. Take, for instance, the reported utterances of the Virgin Mary at Lourdes: "Will you do me the favor of coming here daily for a fortnight?" "I do not promise to make you happy in this world, but in the next; I want many people to come. You will pray for sinners: you will kiss the earth for sinners: Penitence! Penitence! Penitence! Go and tell the priests to cause a chapel to be built; I want people to come thither in processions. Go and drink of the fountain and wash yourself in it. Go and eat of the grass which is there. I am the Immac-

ulate Conception.”¹ If the mother of Jesus really speaks in this way, we feel that the veneration of the Church has been misplaced, or that the souls of the blessed do not progress in wisdom with the lapse of time.

The same applies to the reported utterances of Our Lord to visionaries. Specimens of such cases are to be found in the *Liber Specialis Gratiæ* of St. Mechtilde and the *Legatus Divinæ Pietatis* of St. Gertrude.

Our Lord is represented as placing St. Mechtilde most tenderly over His heart, and saying, “Accept the whole of My Divine heart.” And again, Our Lord says, “As many as shall read this book or hear about you and shall praise Me for what is given to you, by singing the antiphon *Tibi Deus*, or in any other manner, they shall sing to Me in heaven in the presence of the ever adorable Trinity the same number of sweet songs of love.”

When a certain wicked man was chosen Dean of Magdeburg by the canons, Our Lord tells St. Mechtilde, “I have transferred him from his stall to the seat of authority that he may be the food of goats and the nourishment of the unclean.”

To St. Gertrude He says, “I have surely

¹ “Human Personality,” F. W. Myers, vol. i, p. 561.

honored her with these special privileges that anything which any one may hope to obtain by her help, he shall, without doubt, obtain, and whomsoever she shall judge worthy of communion, My loving kindness will never judge unworthy."

On one occasion, when St. Gertrude could not hear mass, Our Lord Himself offered to sing mass to her, and said, "Would you like Me, my dear, to sing mass to you?" And she said, "Indeed I would, O joy of my heart; with all my heart I beg you to do so." "And which mass," said Our Lord, "would you like to hear?" "Whichever you like," said she.

Then said Our Lord, "Would you like the mass for the third Sunday in Advent?" "No," said she.

St. Gertrude then asks for the mass of Christmas Eve, but the Lord finally says He will sing the mass for the third Sunday in Advent, and gives her a joyful understanding of each part in turn, and in the end turns to her, and says:

"The Lord be with you, my dear," and she answered, "And may my spirit be with Thee, my darling." Then the Lord bowed down to the ground before her, and thanked her.

I do not cite these stories to make mock at

them; far from it. They surely represent, in symbol, very real and touching intercourse between the mind of the saint and her Lord, and to me they seem full of meaning and significance. I merely wish to note that it would be very unwise to take too literally all that professes to come from the other world, even when it comes through really good and pious people, without realizing how greatly the temperament and desires of the recipient color and distort the message.

People like St. Gertrude and St. Mechtilde and St. Margaret Mary Alacoque were typically mediumistic in temperament, and immeasurably superior to the ordinary medium of to-day, and yet we cannot but realize how dangerous it would be to attach any serious importance to the accuracy of their reports of their communings with Christ. We may believe that they did indeed commune with Christ, while we rightly reject the message as being a credible saying of Christ. As St. Theresa once said: "Many people imagine that they are talking to Our Lord, when in reality they are talking to themselves."

The same criticism is true, I think, of the majority of reported utterances from the spirit world. Some are very much on the level of the

average sermon: they would not attract the attention of any averagely instructed Christian if they claimed to have been uttered by the local clergyman. Some few are decidedly good specimens of this kind, but the vast majority are terribly poor stuff, and one feels sorry that people can be so deluded as to believe that the spirits of great men and women can descend to such puerilities. This is also true, so far as my own experience has gone, of professional mediums. Occasionally, especially very soon after a death, there may seem something like a genuine attempt to communicate, but by far the greater amount of what passes for information appears to be an attempt to gain information from people who are, as a rule, only too ready to be hypnotized into thinking they have received it, and thus the medium, by telepathy, reproduces the experience of the inquirer. So far as we have gone at present, it seems to me to be hardly likely that any attempt to get into regular touch for any length of time, or to get information of value to the world or to the individual, through mediumistic means will succeed on any large scale, and it is very certain that infinite harm is being done to countless people by continually resorting to

psychic phenomena (which generally means their own subconscious) for the guidance of their own moral and emotional life. Even if we could all of us live in continuous communication with discarnate spirits, we should not necessarily be any better than we are. The brethren of Christ knew Him well, but gained no understanding of Him from their nearness. Only by sharing Christ's spirit can we share His experience, and this is true of all spiritual intercourse. To believe in survival after death has nothing necessarily to do with religion. The Jews, for a great part of their history, had no belief in survival, but a great belief in God; the heathen around them believed firmly in survival and in spirits, but did not believe in the true God. Many people to-day believe firmly in survival and order all their affairs by communing with some supposed spirit, "Buttercup" or "Pansy" or "Feda" or Shakspeare or Joan of Arc, but they do not believe necessarily any more in God. The Kingdom of Heaven is not belief in survival, nor is it communicating with spirits, but it is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

I know that there are a few people here and there who are convinced, after taking every

precaution which is possible, that they have received true, and sometimes exceedingly valuable, messages from their friends.

I do not wish to throw scorn on this experience. I do not wish to say that it is more dangerous than the beginnings of all experiences which are new and, as yet, uncharted. They may rightly urge that, very often, when they have tried to get scientific investigation for their claims, they have only been met with scorn and derision, but I think they must in fairness remember that many fair-minded people are sincerely trying to investigate these problems, and are continually being put off by the exceedingly poor quality of the evidence with which they are confronted.

It may indeed be that we are, as many people believe, on the verge of a new era, when we shall come into far closer touch with the next sphere of being than any we have so far experienced; but I do not believe that, so far, there is any convincing proof that such is the case, and spiritists must realize that it is the duty of the Church meanwhile to warn the public of the great harm that is being done by the misplaced trust given to messages which plainly come from a terrestrial consciousness, and that, often, of no very exalted order.

Immortality and Psychical Research

Belief in the reality of psychic phenomena has no doubt restored to some people a belief in Christ which materialism had killed, but belief in psychic phenomena is not the same thing as belief in the guidance of life by discarnate spirits, which is, unless it is accompanied by a critical disposition which very rarely accompanies it, full of peril to soul, mind, and body. Putting on one side altogether the danger of diabolic agency, which has no doubt been absurdly overstressed by orthodox religion, the tendency, among those who habitually consult mediums, to sheer silliness and self-deception and loss of the critical faculty is a very real and immediate danger. Those who possess psychic faculties should no doubt learn how to control them and use them to good purposes, and under the constant discipline of the conscious mind; and the Church has failed, no doubt, in helping such people, and so driven them away. Those who find themselves naturally brought into communication with the other world need not necessarily deny the reality of the experience, though they will be wise to be very careful they are not self-deceived; but always, and before everything, we need to remember that beyond the cultivation of any psychic gifts there is "the more excellent way" of entering

Authority in Religion

into the spiritual world, the way of Love. To love is a more sure way of entering behind the veil than speaking with the tongues, or writing with the hands, of men and angels, and it is the cultivation of common human virtues which brings us near to God, and procures for us the communion of the saints, and it is by these virtues that we shall be judged when we leave this body of our humiliation to behold the brighter vision. Many at the last will say they have known Christ, and done many mighty works in His name, but those only will be recognized as His friends who have done the works that He did. To see visions of the departed, and to hear their speech, may possibly be given to a few, but to share the lives of those we love is only given to those who share their aspirations, and these, for the most part, will never communicate again with them by any material means.

Now it is urged that all that this evidence gives us is a belief that some spirits survive death for a certain period, and that this is no proof of immortality. But if we have evidence that some people survive death for a week, a month, or a year, and retain their identity, this is in itself a great presumption in favor of further survival. It means, at all events, that

the destruction of the body does not affect personality.

Again, if it is argued that the messages which do come through give only a very faint and blurred reminiscence of the personality, as though this had immensely deteriorated in vividness of power, we may reply that this is also the case in telephony and television. The voice of our friend coming through a bad telephone is a poor, cracked, croaking business, but it is *his voice*: the picture of our friend in America reproduced by television in the paper is covered with haze and innumerable smuts, but it is *his face*: the method of reproduction is no doubt most unsatisfactory, but that is not the question. The question is, "Is there evidence that the personality has survived and is communicating?"

Such reliable evidence as there is, supposing we accept it as genuine, does wonderfully confirm the gospel facts. It shows that some souls survive death, and do, especially for a short time after death, retain the power of communicating with this world, even building up a material body which can be handled—and then tend to get more and more indistinct, and finally cease to communicate altogether by physical means.

Authority in Religion

If the evidence of psychical research be eventually accepted it will powerfully add to the presupposition of individual survival of death, at all events for certain individuals.

And surely this survival *is* to be desired. It would indeed seem to be an almost incredible frustration of all the ends of life, if so great a travail resulted in a still-born birth, if men are brought to so great a height of divinity only to perish as though they had never been born.

The instinct which leads us to believe that there must be a rational purpose in every fact of life leads us strongly to believe that we are not engaged merely in perfecting the race, as a whole, or merely manifesting blindly a universal life, but that we are learning to become active, intelligent, self-conscious participators in eternal life, and that this process, begun in time, will be perfected in eternity—that the work left unfinished here will be complete hereafter, and that we shall be there to see of the travail of our soul and be satisfied with it, and that so we can be, even when we are getting old, and the life of sense is coming to an end, “steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as we know that our labor is not in vain in the Lord.”

VII

CHURCH AND STATE

WHEN Christ was asked whether it were lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or no, he answered, as we all remember, by calling for a penny, pointing out Cæsar's head and title upon it, and saying, "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's." This saying has often been referred to as though it were a deep and final settlement of the whole question at issue. But this is surely a mistake. It does not, as a matter of fact, settle anything at all. The whole difficulty lies in the question, "What *is* Cæsar's, and what *is* God's?" You are obliged, so long as you live in this world, to use Cæsar's money, and Cæsar's laws, and Cæsar's roads, and in doing so you may be either serving God or rebelling against God, or simply ignoring God: you cannot, in practice, separate the two. You cannot take a £1 note and, after observing that it has King George's head on

Authority in Religion

it, say, "This only concerns my duty to the King, and, in spending it, I am in no way responsible to God," or take a Bible, and say, "This is God's book, and has nothing, therefore, to do with my political obligations."

But we are surely wrong in supposing that Christ ever intended His saying about Cæsar to be the enunciation of a great principle. It was really an answer *ad hominem*: His questioners were determined to entangle Him in His talk: He evaded the issue, and left them unanswered and ridiculous. Probably He meant also to say, "This is a question upon which we all have to use our common sense: there *is* no rough-and-ready answer."

Every one, when emerging from childhood, finds himself already a member of a community, a tribe, or State; a community which restricts his liberty, but which also alone makes his life tolerable at all. We have not got to *decide* whether we will belong to a community or not: we wake up to find ourselves sitting, so to speak, in the middle of it: it surrounds us. The unconnected man would really be the most unfree and unprotected of all creatures. Through belonging to the community he is protected against external aggression, and is secured in his individual rights. In return for

this he has to recognize and respect the similar rights of others in the community. The primitive community is concerned, not only with matters of material welfare but with spiritual concerns as well. It orders the ceremonies, sacrifices, and beliefs of the religious life, as well as the material concerns of the society. There is no division between Church and State: there are priests, and generals, and politicians, but all alike are servants of the State, and administer the State's law. There is no toleration for religious dissent; the conscientious objector has short shrift; the citizen who abjures the State's religion is a traitor against the State itself.

In the conditions under which Christianity first appeared in the world, the Jewish State was, as we know, disrupted. The government was in the hands of an alien race, a race which allowed a very wide divergence of religious belief and cultus, but exacted implicit obedience in matters which we now call secular. This was a new situation which religion had to face. There had to be a divergence between the things of the spirit and the things of everyday life. A native priesthood arose which was responsible for religion, and a foreign power wielded the sword in all matters not concerned

Authority in Religion

with religious cultus. This situation was not unfamiliar to the Jews. They had been obliged to make similar provision for the separation of religious and secular affairs ever since they had been subject to Assyrian and Greek bondage. No longer could their kings offer sacrifices, surrounded by their own national priesthood and their royal prophets. Thus we see arising a division between "religious" and "secular" affairs: it is, we must note, an abnormal situation, due to a foreign occupation.

Now the great question at issue is whether this division between "religious" and "secular" is a sign of health and progress, or whether it is a pathological symptom in the body politic.

Is the ideal toward which humanity should be working a sharp division between (1) a Church which should control man's spiritual thoughts, acts and aspirations, and (2) a secular government, which should control his outer acts and relationships, leaving his motives and aspirations to the control of the Church?

This latter is the ideal, consciously or subconsciously held, of the modern man. He considers that the State quite rightly interferes with his outward acts so far as they affect the community, but has, or ought to have, nothing to say to his motives, aspirations or such acts

as do not infringe upon the actions of other citizens. *Libera chiesa in libero stato*—the free Church in the free State—is the ideal of most modern men, whether they are predominantly “religious” or “secular” in their interests.

The State acts by coercion; it insists, by the exaction of penalties, on such a course of action among its citizens as the majority of the community demand. It is not concerned with motives, nor is it concerned with acts which do not involve the interests of other citizens. You may get drunk if you do not break the peace; you may tell lies or swear, so long as you do not injure the interests of other citizens; you may believe anything in heaven or earth, so long as you do not cause a breach of the peace.

The Church, on the other hand, is a society quite distinct from the State, to which citizens can belong, or not belong, as they choose. It is distinguished from the State in that it deals with motives (and not with acts, except in so far as they are the expression of motives); it regards secret acts and thoughts as being as much within its province as the outward expression of such thoughts; it has a right to tell men what to believe and to direct their thoughts and aspirations.

Authority in Religion

The ideal of the modern man is that these two societies should never clash; they should be friendly, but each should keep within its own sphere.

It is believed by many, perhaps by most, Christian people, that such a division between "secular" and "religious" matters was intended, and indeed initiated, by Christ Himself: that He founded a Church to be a society completely apart from the State.

It must be allowed that this idea of the sharp division between things religious and secular, whatever measure of authority it may possess, has considerable attractions for us in our present modern situation. It answers, on the whole, very well to our present needs.

Thoughtful men and women are, in fact, so deeply divided in their views about religious things that it would be quite impracticable for the State to teach any one form of religion; and religiously minded people are so divided also as to the religious implications of various economic theories that the Church is not prepared, and does not desire, to recommend any one particular economic theory to the citizens of the State.

The present division of Church and State does therefore work, in practice, fairly well. In

the thirteenth century this theory might have been tried out in practice on a magnificent scale. The idea of the Pope and the Emperor, as two great coequal vice-regents of God, alike above all merely national authorities, was a magnificent vision. It failed because neither side was great enough to give it a fair trial. Innocent IV and Frederick II were both men of heroic build, but neither of them had moral greatness enough to desire to see such an experiment tried. The Church therefore devoted all its enormous resources to ruining the international empire by the use of very carnal weapons; and it succeeded. The Roman Church definitely killed all hope of a united Europe. It preferred a world disunited to a world united otherwise than under the Papacy. But in doing so, it lost the spiritual leadership of the world, at all events for centuries to come.

So Dr. A. L. Smith says, in his sixth lecture on "Church and State in the Middle Ages," "But had the Church really won? Was the victory of Innocent IV a victory for the Church? Was it even a victory for his own plans? He had taken the Church at her highest and best, in the climax of the thirteenth century, that glorious flowering-time of the Middle Ages, and in eleven years had destroyed

half her power for good, and launched her irretrievably upon a downward course. He had crushed the greatest ruling dynasty since the Cæsars and ruined the greatest attempt at government since the fall of Rome. In ruining the Empire, he had ruined also the future of the Papacy. Was this a victory?"

It is worth while dwelling upon this terrible débâcle of the thirteenth century, because it is just possible that a similar crisis may occur in our own lifetimes. If it should turn out that the League of Nations develops into a confederation of European States, it will be of great interest to watch what will be its relationship toward international Christendom. It is possible that the great Roman Church will so widen its borders as to enable all Christians to return into its communion. It is the only religious body which has the framework and the traditions of an international Church. At present it is impossible for large numbers of men and women who value what they believe to be true in history and theology to enter it. But it may still, unlikely as it now seems, become the Church to which all who value the international outlook will turn at some future epoch. Will it once again make the great mistake which Innocent IV and his successors

made, when they threw away the moral leadership of Europe for the sake of securing political ends? Or will it demonstrate in practice that it is possible to have an international Church and an international State which can work together in friendship for the guidance toward higher ideals of men whose minds and bodies are alike free?

Let us turn to examine a totally different ideal of the relation of Church and State, that which may be definitely called the Anglican ideal.

The best exposition of this ideal is to be found in Hooker's "*Ecclesiastical Polity*." Hooker, and the Anglican Reformers generally, denied the necessity of the division between religious and secular affairs. Taking their stand on the government of the godly Jewish kings, who ruled the Church and State alike under what was held to be Divine inspiration, the Anglican Reformers gave to the Christian Prince the supreme government both in matters of religion and politics over all the citizens of the State. The King was the supreme head of the Church, in the sense that David or Josiah had been. He was, to use the words still used on formal occasions before the sermon in Anglican Churches, "over all persons, and in

[167]

Authority in Religion

all causes, as well ecclesiastical as secular, supreme Head." To him, or to bishops appointed by him, were transferred all the prerogatives formerly intrusted to the Pope. Those bishops and clergy who dissented from him were imprisoned or turned out to starve. Only those who obeyed were allowed to continue in office. There was but one Christian religion, the religion which the King, for the time being, taught. Poor Cranmer, up to the moment of his death, had not been able to solve the problem which troubled him most, viz., what was to happen if the Sovereign himself, God's Vicar upon earth, were a Papist? What if the Sovereign believed in the Pope, and did not believe in his own Headship? Almost, poor Cranmer was inclined to believe, in such a case, you must believe in the Pope on the Sovereign's authority! Death mercifully solved the problem for him. But Hooker takes up the same position.

A gross error it is to think that regal power ought to serve for the good of the body and not of the soul; for men's temporal peace, and not for their eternal safety: as if God had ordained kings for no other end and purpose but only to fat up men like hogs, and to see that they have their mast! Indeed, to lead men unto salvation by the

hand of secret, invisible, and ghostly regiment, or by the external administration of things belonging unto priestly order (such as the word and sacraments are), this is denied unto Christian kings; no cause in the world to think them incapable of supreme authority in the outward government which disposeth the affairs of religion so far forth as the same are disposable by human authority, and to think them incapable thereof, only for that the said religion is everlastingly beneficial to them that faithfully continue in it ("Ecclesiastical Polity," VIII, iii, 2).

It is quite true, of course, that the Anglican Fathers never intended to give the Sovereign the right of ministering in the congregation—this is made clear in the paragraph above (and in this the Sovereign did not take the place of the Pope), but they did give to the King the power to say in the last resort what that doctrine should be and who should have the teaching of it.

This position seems to most of us in modern times so bizarre and absurd that we are apt to forget that it once seemed to great divines most rational, and indeed still appeals to many very wise persons.

For it presupposes a state of things which is never encountered to-day, a state in which

all, or the vast majority of citizens, hold the same religious opinions. In Queen Elizabeth's day, and down almost to living memory, not only the Sovereign but all members of Parliament, all officers of the Army, all mayors and councillors, were communicants of the National Church. Parliament was a representative body, in the sixteenth century, of communicants. The Sovereign in Parliament sat, not only with all the bishops, but with no one except communicants, as his advisers. In such a situation there was much to be said for regarding the King, presiding over a Parliament of communicants and bishops, as God's Vicar upon earth, which cannot reasonably be said to-day. Furthermore, the Pope, as representing the international and catholic idea in religion, had often proved to be so grossly immoral, and so entirely provincial and anti-English in his attitude, that there was very much to be said for reverting to the Jewish type of theocratic State. And this idea of Parliament representing the English people in their Godward relation is by no means yet dead. The English typical distrust of experts still makes the British people more disposed to entrust its religious concerns to a Parliament of average good citizens, whatever their reli-

gious affiliations may be, than to an ecclesiastical body representing bishops, priests and communicants. In this the English religious temper is sharply contrasted with that of Scotland.

The idea is not so absurd as it may seem on paper: it is one which has not served the English race badly on the whole.

Nevertheless, it has this deplorable danger: the Church which takes its orders from a national sovereign or legislature can seldom rise higher than the level of nationalism. At those great testing times of religion, when national pride flames up into war, the great need of a nation, little as it is disposed to allow it, is a Church which is international, and not national, in its government and *ethos*. For this, if for no other reason, we must always hope for a time when, without loss of loyalty to truth, we may see the religious people of the world one in their loyalty to a Church which is wider in its loyalties and ideals than any national Church can ever hope to be.

It seems probable that, in the immediate future, we shall content ourselves with the ideal of the free Church in the free State: the Church concerning itself with the spiritual motives, aspirations and religious observances

Authority in Religion

of the people, the State concerning itself with their material interests and mundane activities. Such would seem to be the only possible compromise, while there is so little cohesion or agreement among those who profess to care about religion.

But this can never be a stable condition of things, just because there never can be in the nature of things a defined frontier between spiritual and material activities. The State, for instance, claims education, marriage and the care of the indigent poor, among mundane activities, and therefore within its rightful province; but the Church can never disinterest itself in such great provinces of human life. And just because the Church cares above all for motives, and the modern State for overt acts, the conclusions of the two bodies must often tend to clash, as in fact they do. The State will often find by experience that it cannot build up loyal citizens except by religion, and that it is therefore intimately concerned with the activities of the Church: the Church will find that it cannot carry on the activities of religion without legal enactments, possession of property, and so on. The popular modern idea that you can teach children "religion" for half an hour, and then give them "secular"

instruction, or that you can run a business on purely non-religious lines, is a delusion resting upon a deplorably low conception of what religion means.

In England we have devised, as we generally do, an illogical and not unsuccessful compromise. It seems, at least, to be illogical, for it never defines very clearly the boundary of Church and State activities, and the two constantly overstep one another's boundaries, to the scandal of those who desire a pedantically accurate demarcation of territories. But perhaps it is not, in reality, so illogical as it seems: for probably the religious and secular activities of mankind have only been parted, as they were parted in Our Lord's days, by the sins and follies of mankind. Perhaps they are no more intended to be parted than our physical and mental activities can be parted. Perhaps the Anglican idea of Hooker and Cranmer has within it more wisdom than would on the surface appear. Perhaps, if mankind were more advanced than it is, there would not be in every nation a king and an archbishop, but one man who would be a King-Priest, or, to put it in modern language, the science of politics and the science of religion would be seen to be one and the same.

Authority in Religion

For surely those men are wrong who would maintain that the religion of Christ is not concerned with the politics of the State. The whole idea of Christianity is sacramental, that is, it is an attempt, and, as we believe, a divinely inspired attempt, to express the will of God in terms of this life, to make God's will done on earth as it is in heaven. This will of God is, if we follow the teaching of Christ, not only that men should pray rightly and believe rightly, and have right motives of conduct and right thoughts, but also that they should have health, and food, and shelter. In the present division of work between Church and State, this carrying out of the will of God devolves partly upon the Church and partly upon the State. No doubt the State often acts in a way which makes it difficult for the follower of Christ to feel that its activities are God-inspired. No doubt, when the State rules men by coercion or lying, when it ignores spiritual realities and resorts for the government of men to political chicanery, then the follower of Christ's religion cannot easily work with or through the State; but these blemishes are to be found not only in the State but in the Church. How often has the Church ruled by lies, by violence, by appeals to baser motives!

It would not be very easy to say, looking back through history, which power has been the more corrupt and un-Christlike, the Church or the State. Perhaps Dr. Coulton's estimate, that on the whole the clergy have in every age generally been about 5 per cent better in their conduct and outlook than other citizens, may be accepted as true. But the *aims* and *ideals* of the State, to care for men's bodies and minds, to clothe, feed, house, and educate men, are Christlike and religious ideals. A man cannot be a follower of Christ who cuts out these ideals from his spiritual outlook, nor do I believe that he can be a good Christian without being also a keen citizen. Quite probably we may, in the time to come, transcend the present divorce between sacred and secular activities and return, in some higher form, to the idea of the theocracy, the federation of religious States; but meanwhile we must never forget that those activities which the State undertakes, largely because the Church has failed in its attempt to carry them out, are profoundly religious works, without which all our prayers and sacraments would be meaningless and immoral, and that those who educate the young and minister to the sick and aged are in the most real sense ministers of religion, though

they may not be ordained ministers of the Church.

It is sometimes still urged that the Church should concern itself only with motives, and should remain dissociate from all "secular" activities, from the active care of men's bodies and minds.

It is perfectly true that no political institutions can function properly if the individuals who have to run them are immoral. It is therefore no doubt a primary duty of the Church to provide the institutions of the State with God-fearing and moral citizens; but also it is true that no people can serve God as God intends them to serve Him, if they are starving, or naked, or untrained and undisciplined in mind. If God cares for human welfare at all, He must care profoundly for the work which the State is attempting to do, and therefore a Christian State is a noble ideal, a real "Body of Christ," in whose welfare every Christian man and woman ought to be interested, and for whose welfare he has his own share of responsibility before God.

Dr. Rivers's remarks, which have already been quoted, on the necessity for the dissociation of human activities in the past, which he illustrated by the growing division between the

priest and the doctor, and the need in our day for their re-association and coöperation, the division having now served its purpose, may also be true of the division between Church and State. It may be that the dissociation has proceeded far enough, and that mankind needs to realize that it is impossible to treat any so-called secular problem without reference to religion, or any so-called religious problem without reference to political principles and actions. A religion all in the air, which can only enumerate principles, and cannot incarnate itself into institutions and acts, will forever remain uninteresting and morally powerless; and a State which proclaims its disinterestedness in religion will be forever unable to carry into effect even the most ably conceived plans for human betterment.

A Church implies a State, a State implies a Church. Neither can exist for long apart from the other, for Church and State are by the Divine Will joined in an eternal marriage, and of them it is preëminently true, "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

This close coöperation of those who are primarily interested in motives and aspirations and those who are mainly interested in the carrying of motives into external actions—of

Authority in Religion

the introverts and extroverts of life—is hindered, so long as there is no international Church and no international State. So long as unmitigated nationalism holds, so long there must be a spiritual body in each State which shall hold up the cause of abstract justice as against the one-sidedness and pettiness and rancor of national patriotism: but if some larger State should ever develop, some “Parliament of the World,” then that closer approximation of the two divorced interests may take place, which we know in its primitive form in the Jewish theocracy, or the religious Greek and Roman communities—an international religious State which could be equally well called a Catholic Church, one in its memberships, its beliefs, and its objectives.

This vision may seem a false one to those who believe that Jesus definitely aimed at founding a Church apart from the community of mankind. Such a body was no doubt a necessity, while the State was what it was at that day—an incarnate repudiation of the Law of God; but there is no reason to suppose that Jesus deliberately envisaged this separation as a permanent and desirable condition of things. A Church apart, and even hostile to the State, was at that time a necessity and a gain

to mankind, and so it may be to-day; but the alienation, necessary for the moment, was necessary only as a preparation for the time when man as a whole, and not in sections, could be called to that salvation which includes the salvation of the body and intellect, as well as the spirit of man.

VIII

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

WE are acutely conscious in our minds of the conflict between the world as we feel it should be and the world as it actually is. We cannot help feeling that the world ought to be a good place for good people to live in and a bad place for bad people: that goodness should be rewarded and vice punished. We love the novels and plays where these things happen; we love even the advertisements in stations of the English watering-places, where the sky and sea are always deep blue, and women have to carry gay parasols to keep off the tropical rays of the sun. It is not that we have not been to these places and seen them for ourselves. We know quite well that even in August there is generally a sky of leaden gray, and we have to wear great-coats to keep off the northerly winds, and a waterproof to keep off the rain. But we feel that the railway poster truly expresses what *ought* to be true, and what we want to believe

The Kingdom of Heaven

will be true when our holiday comes—though in our hearts we know it seldom is. We persist in going to the plays where the hero, after moderate and quite bearable disappointments, marries the heroine and lives happily ever afterward. We wave gallantly the banner of our desires, to comfort us under the disappointments of our actual life.

But now we are living in an age when to do this is held to be a mark of insincerity. Our artists and poets and novelists love to remind us that life is not like the railway poster, where gay young people disport themselves under summer skies. They love to paint for us the woodlouse, and the sewage farm, and the hydrocephalous child; they paint us pictures of decaying corpses and manure heaps: they write us stories of good men who go mad, and lovers who are persistently and inevitably disloyal to their mates. Our music is like that of the negro beating the tomtom in a primeval forest. To have a melody is to be untrue to our belief in a drab and unmelodious world. Let us at all costs, they say, be sincere. Let us remember that ninety-nine sunsets out of a hundred are ugly, and most of the men and women that we see as we go to work are crushed and ill-shapen and uninteresting.

Authority in Religion

This reaction in the midst of which we are living has in it something to be admired, depressing as it is. It is an effort after sincerity. It says to us: "Do not talk to me about life being beautiful, until you can show me beauty in the slugs and the manure heap, and the trenches of Flanders. Let us face the facts at all costs, and, when we have done that, let us then see what beauty remains."

This is the difference between Disraeli's novels, where all the heroes are dukes, preparing to marry the daughters of millionaires, and the novels of Hardy, where men and women strive in agony after love, crushed down with the weight of an inevitable ancestral curse.

Now religion is that faculty in man which makes him persistently believe that the world is both rational and beautiful; that there is beauty and harmony in life, and that to find it does not entail our being blind to truth; that goodness and truth and beauty can live together in mutual harmony and enrichment.

A bad religion achieves this paradise of belief by *ignoring* the facts. It deliberately twists the facts of life to suit its own purposes. If a young man dies, it says "how fortunate it is that he has been saved from inevitable sin"; if, in answer to prayers, he lives, it says how won-

The Kingdom of Heaven

derful and inevitable is the answer to a good father's prayer. If a city is destroyed by an earthquake, it says that we have always recognized how wicked that particular city was; if a good nation wins in a war, it says what a striking instance this is of the reward of virtue: if it loses, it remembers how greatly lacking this otherwise excellent nation was in respect for the conventional institutions of the Church. Whatever happens, we must always show that virtue is automatically rewarded, and evil inevitably overthrown.

Now Jesus believed in the ideal world as much as any idealist could do. He believed that He was, and that every man may become, the child of God. This world, He believed, is destined to manifest the beautiful purpose of God. It was brought into being for that end. There is no force within it which cannot subserve the highest values which man can conceive. When He prayed that God's will might be done on earth as it is in heaven, He knew that He was praying for something which not only could be accomplished, but which was in line with the natural destiny of things. This faith He shared with the romanticist, who loves to think of his favorite watering-place as bathed in eternal sunshine. But Jesus was under no illusions as to

Authority in Religion

the actual condition of the world of His day. If anything, He would seem to us to color it too black. He saw it inhabited, and indeed dominated, by spirits of evil. The "Prince of this world," the dominant force of the actual world He knew, had nothing in common with Him, or with that Father who had created the world. The present condition of the world as He knew it, He regarded as a foreign and hostile usurpation.

This outlook upon the world, as dominated by a hostile power, is contrary to our habitual modern view that the present condition of the world as we know it has been arrived at by an orderly progression, each age being superior to the last. But, as Dr. Rivers has pointed out ("Medicine, Magic, and Religion"), we have been so obsessed by the idea of an orderly evolution that we have left out the possibility of degradation. It is almost certain, so anthropologists tell us, that some unprogressive races, as we call them, are not merely unprogressive, but are definitely degraded. There is nothing irrational in supposing that the whole world has fallen back, or remained unevolved, when it might have progressed. The belief of Jesus was that the power of hatred and cruelty is strongly entrenched in a world where it has no

business to be. The myth or symbol which regards Satan as a fallen angel may mean that what we call evil is a degraded or pathological form of good—a good which has not merely failed to progress, but has become definitely and positively evil by failing to progress, like the cancer cells in the human body. This evil had, so Jesus taught, gained so complete a hold on the world, that nothing could dislodge it but a heroic courage, based upon, and nourished, by a firm and lucid faith in the will of God for good. Those who had such a firm faith could, He believed, assault the strong man armed, and take his stronghold and divide his spoil; but He would not minimize the terrific severity of the fight to be waged, before evil could be dislodged from its position of dominance in the world.

This faith which Jesus held, put into our modern language, means that the world of values *can* be made the world of fact. By Imagination, the world based upon Love and Reason is clearly discerned as an ideal: by faith we believe that the ideal can be manifested as reality upon this plane upon which we live: by heroic courage and patient research we actually translate our ideals into realities. First comes Imagination, the vision of the seer, who sees the

Authority in Religion

Divine purpose; then the faith of the believer, who knows that he can alter the face of the world; then the courage of the scientist, the statesman, the man of action who builds that Kingdom on earth whose plan he has first seen in heaven.

Faith in reason is the trust that the ultimate natures of things lie together in a harmony which excludes mere arbitrariness. It is the faith that at the base of things we shall not find mere arbitrary mystery. . . . To experience this faith is to know that in being ourselves we are more than ourselves: to know that our experience, dim and fragmentary as it is, yet sounds the utmost depths of reality: to know that detached details, merely in order to be themselves, demand that they should find themselves in a system of things: to know that this system includes the harmony of logical rationality, and the harmony of æsthetic achievement: to know that while the harmony of logic lies upon the universe as an iron necessity, the æsthetic harmony stands before it as a living ideal moulding the general flux in its broken progress towards finer subtler issues.¹

For the kingdom which we discern as having its dwelling-place in the heavens, outside space

¹ "Science and the Modern World," Whitehead, pp. 23-24.

The Kingdom of Heaven

and time, has got to be built here also, under the stringent conditions of our present life. We are definitely placed here in order to build God's City with the bricks and mortar of our own mother earth.

It is quite true that we live in a condition which is destined to pass away; it is quite true that we have no certainty that our work will not be a failure, so far as this terrestrial world is concerned, which may quite conceivably reject the Kingdom of Heaven, and so perish, as perhaps other worlds have done, or may perish by some purely physical catastrophe; but we are here for no other purpose than to build God's City in our own country and in our own age. "*Heureux ceux,*" said Charles Peguy, "*qui sont morts pour les cités charnelles, car elles sont le corps de la cité de Dieu.*"

Religion loses its power when it ceases to incarnate itself into the life of time and space: and not only does religion lose its being, when it tries to keep apart from this contingent life, but the material world loses its value and beauty, and grows dead and meaningless when it loses contact with the vision of God. When you look at one of our industrial northern cities, built at a time when people had lost sight of the intimate relation between the eternal

City of God and our material cities of brick and stone, you see in their gloomy, lifeless, expressionless exterior, in their chimneys belching out filth into the streets and into the courtyards which have once been gardens, in their churches and chapels with pretentious, ill-proportioned façades thrust forward toward the eyes of men, and their mean, squalid backs, where only God's eye can see them—in all this you see how this loss of contact between the vision of God's City, eternal in the heavens, and man's city here on the earth is the cause of the degradation of our municipal and ecclesiastical life.

We owe many good things to that spirit which brought Protestantism into birth, but we do owe a grudge to that spirit which said that we must close our eyes and shut our ears in order that we might find God, which was always scenting out idolatry wherever men tried to express their sense of God's presence in pictures, or in buildings, or in song. It is a terrible and devastating heresy which would make a radical opposition between spirit and matter, as though the one were good and the other evil; which preaches the non-significance of matter and the all-importance of naked and unmediated spirit. About this heresy Dr. Whitehead remarks:

The Kingdom of Heaven

The independence ascribed to bodily substance carried them away from the realm of values altogether. They degenerated into a mechanism entirely valueless, except as suggestive of an external ingenuity. The heavens had lost the glory of God. This state of mind is illustrated in the recoil of Protestantism from æsthetic effects dependent upon a material medium. It was taken to lead to an ascription of value to what is in itself valueless. . . . The assumption of the bare valuelessness of mere matter led to a lack of reverence in the treatment of natural or artistic beauty. Just when the urbanisation of the Western world was entering upon its state of rapid development, and when the most delicate, anxious consideration of the æsthetic qualities of the new material environment was requisite, the doctrine of the irrelevance of such ideas was at its height. In the most advanced industrial countries, art was treated as a frivolity. A striking example of this state of mind in the middle of the nineteenth century is to be seen in London, where the marvellous beauty of the estuary of the Thames, as it curves through the city, is wantonly defaced by the Charing Cross railway bridge, constructed apart from any reference to æsthetic values.¹

We must, therefore, have in this world earthly, visible counterparts to the heavenly

¹ "Science and the Modern World," Whitehead, p. 243.

patterns which are seen by the spiritual eye; we must have churches and cities, and national governments. And these earthly counterparts of the eternal verities are not merely of the earth, earthy: they are to us the channels whereby Divine truths are mediated to us. This is, of course, the true meaning of sacramentalism. To be a sacramentalist does not mean that we think it immensely important that a person should be baptized and be a communicant; to believe in baptism means that we see the immense *spiritual* importance and significance of being clean, that to be physically clean is not only a sanitary precaution, not only a symbol, but a means, of being mentally clean; to believe in the Eucharist means that we believe that sitting down to food with other people is not merely to eat with them but to share their mind, and so find God in them; that a bath is much more than a bath, and a meal much more than a meal; that the actual condition of our colleges and cities and churches really is an index to our belief about God; that our teachers and clergy and statesmen ought to be not merely worldly functionaries but prophets of God, who are really able to say, "Thus saith the Lord." This is the true sacramentalism, and it depends upon a real belief that the Kingdom

The Kingdom of Heaven

of Heaven is the greatest of all realities, and that all the beauty, and significance, and value, of our short and temporary lives here on earth depend upon our continuous vision of that supreme reality.

No one, in modern times, no one perhaps since Plato, has helped us to understand the meaning of all this so much as Wordsworth.

To him Imagination, the power of seeing eternal truth embodied in visible phenomena, was the highest gift which man possesses. Its essential features are, says Professor de Sélin-court, (1) the overwhelming consciousness of God, (2) the sense that God in nature is one with God in the soul, so that the soul seems to *be* God or *be* nature, (3) (a natural consequence of (2)) the sense of creative power in the soul.

It is the lack of this continuous and clear vision of God's eternal kingdom of values which leads to what Wordsworth calls "A treasonable growth of indecisive judgments."

Having no clear vision of the ultimate values of life, we have nothing to which to relate our earthly plans and happenings, no standard of comparison by which to judge them, and hence we see—

Authority in Religion

On every side fall off, we know not how,
To selfishness, disguised in gentle names
Of peace, and quiet, and domestic love.

But the true child of God is confident that through earthly love and through daily work he can find God.

Là, O mon âme, au plus haut ciel guidée
Tu y pourras reconnaître l'Idée
De la beauté qu'en ce monde j'adore.

Of such people, who have learnt to guide their lives by the vision of the divine loveliness, Wordsworth tells us:

Them the enduring and the transient both
 Serve to exalt; they build up greatest things
 From least suggestions; ever on the watch,
 Willing to work and to be wrought upon,
 They need not extraordinary calls
 To rouse them; in a world of life they live,
 By sensible impressions not enthralled,
 But by their quickening impulse made more prompt
 To hold fit converse with the spiritual world
 And with the generations of mankind
 Spread over time, past, present, and to come,
 Age after age, till time shall be no more.
 Such minds are truly from the Deity,
 For they are powers; and hence the highest bliss

The Kingdom of Heaven

That flesh can know is theirs—the consciousness
Of Whom they are, habitually interfused
Through every image and through every thought,
And all affections by communion raised
From earth to heaven, from human to divine.
Hence endless occupation for the soul,
Whether discursive or intuitive;
Hence cheerfulness for acts of daily life,
Emotions which best foresight need not fear,
Most worthy then of trust when most intense.
Hence, amidst ills that vex and wrongs that crush
Our hearts—if here the words of Holy Writ
May with fit reverence be applied—that peace
Which passeth understanding, that repose
In moral judgments, which form this pure source
Must come, or will by man be sought in vain.

So, with Cowper, we may well say:

Happy who walks with Him! who what he finds
Of flavour or of scent in fruit or flower,
Or what he views of beautiful or grand,
In nature, from the broad majestic oak
To the green blade that twinkles in the sun
Prompts with remembrance of a present God.

So if we believe in the Kingdom of God, as
the true reality which this earthly frame is in-
tended to manifest, then we shall not only *see*
the Kingdom, but we shall enter into it through
our vision of the inner meaning and significance

Authority in Religion

of those things which we apprehend with our physical senses.

But we must not be content to sit and contemplate reality through its earthly sacraments: we must *build up* the Kingdom through vigorous work. The earth is still full of darkness and cruel habitations, and our vision of reality will quickly fade from us if we are not vigorously setting to work to pull down the old and build the new.

Let us learn not to be afraid of the new forms in which God expresses Himself in each generation.

Religion [says Professor Whitehead] will not regain its old power until it can face change in the same spirit as does science. Its principles may be eternal, but the expression of those principles requires continual development. This evolution of religion is in the main a disengagement of its own proper ideas from the adventitious notions which have crept into it by reason of the expression of its own ideas in terms of the imaginative picture of the world entertained in previous ages.

We need to pray to be delivered from the bondage of the letter into the freedom of the spirit. "Tua nos misericordia Deus, et ab omni vetustate expurgas, et capaces sanctæ civitatis efficias."

The Kingdom of Heaven

I do indeed believe that never has there been so wide and accurate understanding of the vision and ideals of Jesus, of His inspired and inspiring faith in God and man, and I do with all my heart believe that His vision and faith, expressed in terms of the science of our own day, is still the salvation of the world.

And I believe that science, which seemed to many of us, in the past, to have taken God out of life, is going in the future to help us to see that beauty, and value, and significance, in life, which are, to all of us who believe what Jesus believed, the very footprints of God.

Science is now coming to see, as the great poets have seen, life and purpose where in the last generation it saw only dead mechanical properties. It is coming to see purpose and love, and a continual integration toward higher forms of life, where before it saw neither purpose, nor beauty, nor hope, but only a blind progress brought about by a chapter of fortunate accidents.

We live in days when much of the structure which enshrined our religion in old days is being taken away, but only, I am sure, in order that a far more lovely temple may take its place. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build a temple made without hands" is so

Authority in Religion

true a saying. You can destroy some presentation of religion which has seemed in the past absolutely essential to its permanence, and before you have time to mourn the old, already religion is fashioning for itself some more wonderful presentation.

Religion [says Professor Whitehead] is the one element in human experience which persistently shows an upward trend. It fades and then recurs. But when it renews its force, it recurs with an added richness and purity of content. The fact of the religious vision, and its history of persistent expansion, is our ground of optimism. Apart from it, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyment lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experience.¹

I believe that when once we have seen the vision of the Kingdom of God, the purpose which is gradually filling all life with increasing measures of beauty and order and goodness, we shall be able with more and more certainty and precision "to fight the lies which vex God's ransom'd earth," and, where temporarily we are defeated, we shall have so great an inner certainty of the ultimate victory of God's cause, that we shall be able to go about our work,

¹ "Science and the Modern World," Whitehead, p. 238.

The Kingdom of Heaven

whatever it may be, not only with serenity, but with a sense that we can, and must, overcome the world.

But great as the life of external action indeed is, still greater is the life of internal converse with God. "Lord, even the devils are subject to us through Thy Name," said the amazed disciples, when they realized the power put at their disposal by the understanding of God's nature and purpose. And the answer of Jesus is significant—"I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven. Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke x. 17, 20). Greater even than any external achievements of the practical religious spirit is the sense of fellowship with the Divine Father. That is the real end of life, to know God, to taste and see that He is gracious, to see God in all things, and to see all things in God.

THE END OF THE WORLD

THE END OF THE WORLD

THE END OF THE WORLD

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
VOLUME LXXV
PART I
1945

230.03 S

Anson, H.

An 82

Authority in religion

	Gene	OCT 1935		C. Lane	7 FEB 1935
10/1	11				

230.03 S

An 82

O

